

*Public Service*

interest rates so that the Canadian people may enjoy short, mid- and long-term loans at more reasonable prices.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The House had heard the motion of the hon. member. Under Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent; the motion cannot therefore be put.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PUBLIC SERVICE****APPOINTMENT OF MICHAEL PITFIELD—CHANGE IN MERIT SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION**

**Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to seek leave of the House to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of press reports attributed to the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) about the appointment of Michael Pitfield and his own demotion from cabinet, and also in view of the necessity of preserving the merit system in the public service, I should like to move:

That the House request the Prime Minister to make a full and detailed statement on all circumstances surrounding the appointment of Michael Pitfield as Clerk of the Privy Council and secretary to the cabinet including the specific reasons for his appointment, whether or not the merit system was followed, the names of all senior public servants who were also considered for the appointment and the reasons that they were found unacceptable, whether or not Mr. Pitfield recommended to the Prime Minister that the former minister of consumer and corporate affairs be relieved of his post, and whether or not the Prime Minister will make additional appointments to high positions in the public service from among his friends and admirers.

**Mr. Trudeau:** What about changes in the shadow cabinet?

**Mr. Baldwin:** How about merit in the cabinet?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would remind hon. members of the provisions of Standing Order 43. It is an important device and an important rule for the benefit of members who wish to bring a matter to the attention of the House. To quote the rule, it provides:

A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice having been given under Standing Order 42.

It is the custom, of course, to put such motions to the House because they cannot be moved without unanimous consent. Simply because they require unanimous consent, however, that is not evidence that motions put forward under that rule ought not to conform with the basic requirements of the regulations which are that it be a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. I would remind hon. members that they ought to respect that part of the regulation. In this particular case, while I have some reservations about the urgency or pressing necessity of the subject, I am prepared to ask if there is unanimous con-

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

sent that the motion be put. I should remind hon. members however that they ought not to attempt to extend the provisions of the rule.

This motion has been heard by the House. As it was proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 it cannot be put without unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There not being unanimous consent the motion cannot be put to the House.

**Mr. Cossitt:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With due respect to the Chair, I would simply say in regard to this matter that I feel I am within the rules in presenting a motion at this time under the term "urgent and pressing necessity" when it seems to be a question that the merit system in the public service could be breached—

**Some hon. Members:** Order, order!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The House was, in fact, asked for unanimous consent as the hon. member knows. Oral Questions.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**IMMIGRATION****ALLEGED ADOPTION OF RESTRICTIVE POLICY—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the right hon. the Prime Minister relates to the statement made a couple of weeks ago by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration confirming that the government is examining the implications of the dramatic increase in applications for immigration. Has the government decided to change the regulations under which relatives of people already in the country can be nominated as immigrants? If this decision has been made, can the Prime Minister indicate briefly the nature of the change?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, as was announced in the Speech from the Throne, a policy paper on immigration will be published in the new year. This will indicate some new directions which the government proposes and which we hope will be fully discussed in this House. As to any interim measures taken before then, all I can say at this moment is if any announcement is to be made it will be made by the government in this House. I would say that I can guarantee in advance that if such is the case it will not depart from the practice of government and of the law of ensuring a policy which is universal and non-discriminatory in its selection criteria.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Prime Minister tell the House whether the