

Non-Confidence in Deputy Speaker

I think the Minister of Labour would do well to bring that remark to the attention of the trustees so that they may have the appointment approved as soon as possible to protect the democratic rights of S.I.U. members.

Mr. Real Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, nobody in Canada will take exception to the decision made by the trustees of the S.I.U. with regard to Hal Banks who, I am quite sure, does not deserve anybody's confidence in Canada and more particularly that of the members of the S.I.U.

However, I endorse the remark just made by the hon. member for Lake St. John to the effect that the appointment of the new president, Mr. Turner, goes a little beyond the democratic spirit that should prevail in a labour union and that this appointment should be ratified as soon as possible by the union itself.

At all events, the removal of Hal Banks will benefit every really democratic union in our country.

[Text]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION OF NON-CONFIDENCE IN DEPUTY SPEAKER

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Gregoire (Lapointe) moved:

That, in view of the unacceptable actions of the Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for Stormont, during the sitting on Friday, March 13, 1964, from 8 to 10 p.m.

(1) In transgressing a standing order of the house which requires that unanimous consent be given to waive the obligation for two days' notice of the presentation of a resolution prescribed by standing order 41;

(2) In transgressing standing order 42 of the house which requires that the member who presents a motion of urgency, with the unanimous consent of the house, without notice thereof as required in standing order 41, must previously explain the urgency of the same; and

(3) In depriving certain members of the house of a right and privilege recognized by standing orders;

For these reasons, be it resolved that the Deputy Speaker no longer has the confidence of this house.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a motion which is serious and also very rare in the House of Commons. It is a non-confidence motion against the Deputy Speaker for his conduct of last Friday, March 13, from 8 to 10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I shall try to introduce our arguments and evidence in as realistic a way as possible and without feelings of hatred or hostility, and to state the facts as objectively as possible for the information of members of this house.

[Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John).]

That happened, as we know, when the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) presented a motion recommending the sending of Canadian troops to Cyprus through the United Nations.

Personally, I was in favour of the Prime Minister's motion, but I did not approve the procedure followed that evening. Therefore, my criticism is aimed today not at the motion itself but at the procedure.

Let us go over the facts. In the course of the debate on supplementary estimates, the country's Prime Minister walked into the house in the afternoon and asked for unanimous consent to revert to motions, as reported on page 892, left hand column, of *Hansard* for March 13, 1964.

The first point on which I call the attention of the house is that immediately after the Prime Minister asked permission to revert to motions, the Acting Speaker, Mr. Batten, rose and asked:

Does the house give unanimous consent to revert to motions?

And hon. members replied:

Agreed.

I should like the hon. members of the house to take good note of what happened. The Acting Speaker took the trouble to rise and ask whether the Prime Minister had the unanimous consent of the house.

The Prime Minister then rose and, on motions, as can be found on page 892 of *Hansard*, he said:

If this announcement is received from New York before 6 p.m. I shall ask for unanimous consent for the house to consider this afternoon and this evening, if necessary, a resolution approving Canadian participation in the United Nations peace keeping force in the manner described in the resolution.

So the Prime Minister told the house that he would be asking unanimous consent to sit in order to discuss a resolution approving Canadian participation in the United Nations force.

That was the purpose of the Prime Minister's motion. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), as he had a right to, agreed to give unanimous consent on behalf of his party, and so did the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas). It was also the same in the case of the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Patterson).

But the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) rose at that time and said, as can be seen on page 894 of *Hansard*:

I am entirely against the Canadian parliament being asked to sit this evening or tomorrow, or to hold a special sitting—

Mark these words—

—in order to consider whether troops should be sent to Cyprus or to that continent.