

*Privilege—Mr. A. Lambert*

particular member. It was not done as a gimmick or as a new exploration of a technique; it was done in good faith.

I am satisfied that the camera and production crews were attempting to do the proper thing. It did set a dangerous precedent though, and all of us are grateful that it was brought to our attention by the hon. member. It will keep us alert on a continuing basis to see that we are careful and faithful to the fundamental principle of electronic *Hansard* as we have been so far successfully.

\* \* \*

● (1512)

[Translation]

**PRIVILEGE**

MR. LAMBERT (BELLECHASSE)—REQUEST FOR REVISION OF  
STANDING ORDER 43

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, again today we have witnessed something which has become a regular occurrence in the House, and the public watching the televised debates is wondering and asking us questions. I do wish we could give an adequate answer to the questions on the various standing orders governing our debates. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the people of this country are voicing their opinion. That is extremely important, since we are spending millions to broadcast our debates so that Canadians may have a better understanding of the orders of the House, the reasons for a specific ruling or for the attitude of an hon. member regarding motions or orders or bills put before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think that since the inception of parliamentary broadcasting, we as members of the House gladly put up with the physical inconvenience of glaring floodlights which considerably raise the temperature inside this chamber. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I accept that because I want Canadians to be more closely associated with the governing body in order to improve the efficiency of the government.

Mr. Speaker, you have been making tremendous efforts and I am very pleased to say so today, because you have a very difficult part to play. Through my question of privilege, I want to show all Canadians how difficult it is to perform this duty in an impartial way in order to give all representatives of this country, those I refer to as the delegates of the general assembly representing the whole country, the opportunity to be seen and heard. I hope all Canadians who will be listening to what I am saying will understand how difficult it is to deliberate in a democratic way under rules which do not provide us with the means of making ourselves understood. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about Standing Order 43. This very day, I rose under the provisions of Standing Order 43, duly seconded as required by these provisions, to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing

[Mr. Speaker.]

necessity, because we are precisely in a situation I would describe as panic over our national constitution, a constitution which should be the political creed of every Canadian, whatever his language and extraction. As Canadians, we should all have exactly the same political creed.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is discussing the motion he has proposed himself this afternoon under Standing Order 43. Surely this is not the moment to discuss the merits of the motion. It is simply a matter of raising the question of privilege. This raises a difficulty for all members of the House when a motion is moved under Standing Order 43. According to the rules of the House, every member has the right to deny unanimous consent. If the hon. member has another question of privilege to raise, I will listen to him carefully.

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is your duty to address these remarks to me, but as members of the House we must live daily with the application of Standing Order 43. This very day, Mr. Speaker, I moved a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity which concerns not only all parliamentarians, but all Canadians as well. If I rise on a question of privilege, it is because I deplore the fact that the opposition of only one member is enough to prevent the discussion of a motion under Standing Order 43. I remember that not so long ago, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) raised this matter. A few months ago, I had the opportunity myself to suggest that Standing Order 43 be reviewed. In conclusion, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette):

That this House refer to the Committee on Procedure and Organization for review the implementation of Standing Order 43, in order to ensure that the rules of democracy are strictly adhered to and that no single member is empowered under these provisions to go against the will of all the others.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that ours is a democratic institution and that we should indeed give all its members the opportunity to deal objectively and positively with the motions put before the House. That is why I suggest that the motion I am now moving seconded by the hon. member for Témiscamingue, should be referred to the Committee on Procedure and Organization for a full study of the implementation of Standing Order 43.

**Mr. Gilles Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I support the request made by my colleague for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert). In fact, the Chair has pointed out several times that there was abuse on the part of hon. members moving motions under Standing Order 43. If there is abuse in the presentation of motions under Standing Order 43, it is precisely because there is also abuse in the process of rejecting such motions.

Generally speaking, motions moved under Standing Order 43 are accepted, especially when they concern innocuous matters, for instance congratulations to the Montreal Canadiens when they win the Stanley Cup, to the Alouettes when they