

Mr. Broadbent: Source?

Mr. Horner:—and not 12 per cent. I stand by the 8.9 per cent figure I gave the hon. member on Monday. I would like to take this opportunity to point out that I did not read the blues. *Hansard* indicates that we were meeting with the automotive manufacturers “today”. I meant to say that we will be meeting with them throughout this month and next month. The word “today” was misused either by me or by *Hansard*, and that is the only mistake in Monday’s *Hansard* which I will accept.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby gave the Chair notice of his intention to raise this question of privilege. The minister followed the contribution made by the hon. member. The matter reduces itself to a dispute as to the accuracy of facts. It is now well on the record. That, clearly, is a matter for debate and dispute, it does not constitute a question of privilege.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a brief point of order with respect to the observation you made at the beginning of the proceedings today regarding motions under Standing Order 43. Your Honour suggested—I take it it was a suggestion only, and I hope it was not a ruling—that hon. members might consider limiting themselves with respect to the subject matter of motions under Standing Order 43, on the ground that they could raise matters during the course of the throne speech debate. The fact is that some hon. members will be able to raise matters at that time, but not all members because of the limitation of time.

The other significant difference—and I say this with deference—is the difference between what is a motion under Standing Order 43 and what is a speech and what matters can be raised. A motion under Standing Order 43, under the terms of our rules, is a motion moved on an urgent basis, and whether or not there is an opportunity for anyone to speak about it, its purpose is to raise a matter which is considered urgent. The Chair can always rule it out of order as not being urgent. However, that is something the Chair has to do. It is only a motion. It is an opportunity for a member of this House to ask the House whether it can come to a conclusion. The difference between such a motion and a speech in the throne speech debate is that there are very few opportunities for motions during the throne speech debate. If we were to conduct the business with respect to Standing Order 43 in the way in which your Honour suggested, the right of members to make motions, as opposed to speeches, would be prohibited.

● (1512)

When a member moves a motion under Standing Order 43, the member is not asking for an opportunity to debate it. What the member is asking the House for, and hopes for, is that there will be a vote then and there on his opportunity, as a private member, to present a motion.

I listened to what Your Honour said. I did not think it was a ruling. However, I wanted to make these observations because I believe that if Your Honour’s suggestion is followed, the right of members to make motions, as the rule states, on

S.O. 43

matters of urgent and pressing necessity, will be limited. Therefore, the rights of members of this House would be limited.

As House leader of the official opposition, I think it is important to bring this matter to Your Honour’s attention. It affects not only opposition members but all members of this House who are not members of the government. It is an important right, a right that by tradition has become narrowed. But narrow as it is, it is still there. It ought not to be further limited, and there ought to be no implication about limitation. I say that with great respect.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton raises, by way of a point of order, a request for clarification of what I said earlier in the day. In the course of doing so he has made a misinterpretation of the effect of Standing Order 43, which ought to be cleared up.

What Standing Order 43 does is give private members the opportunity to ask the House to set aside the business of the day in order to debate something else. The motion is debatable. Accordingly, whenever consent is asked pursuant to Standing Order 43, consent is not simply being asked—this ought to be understood—that a motion be taken into consideration and voted upon at that moment; consent is being asked that the business of the House be set aside in order to launch upon debate on another matter.

I have said that in respect of days when the Speech from the Throne is under consideration, and similarly on budget days and opposition days, there seems to be a knee-jerk reaction, when we arrive at the hour appointed for Standing Order 43 motions, to suggest that the matter before the House, which permits the widest possible debate and discussion, be set aside in order to debate something else.

I want to stress this. It is quite proper for any member, during any day of House business, during the appointed time to introduce any motion pursuant to Standing Order 43. That right can never be taken away by the Chair. I only ask hon. members to consider seriously the situation in which they find themselves and the situation for which they are asking the consent of the House.

When we have a subject before the House which permits the greatest latitude for debate, there ought at least to be a second thought with regard to what the member is doing, that is, asking the House to set aside a matter in order to give that member an opportunity to speak and criticize the government on certain points, when in fact the subject matter before the House gives the member the widest possible latitude to attack the government, if that is the purport of the motion. It is with most.

Some motions would still qualify quite easily for intelligent consideration under Standing Order 43. I was simply asking members to exercise some discretion and judgment when doing so on a day on which the subject matter for debate is of such wide latitude.