

*Procedure and Organization*

of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) concerning rule 75c meets neither the views of the hon. members of the opposition nor those of the people. Indeed public opinion is beginning to realize that hon. members of the opposition are absolutely right.

We are receiving from all over messages encouraging us to continue the fight, and to attempt to make the government understand the soundness of our claims which are, for all practical purposes, those of the Canadian people.

Several dailies have even published articles dealing with the proposal of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). I have here an article written by Claude Ryan, in yesterday's *Le Devoir*, dealing with the proposed rule 75c. It is interesting to note that Mr. Claude Ryan is in complete agreement with the opposition in regard to the proposal of the President of the Privy Council, and in my view he is even encouraging the opposition to keep on fighting.

Here is what Mr. Claude Ryan said in his editorial of July 15, and I quote:

Further to his strong statement made on this subject in the House of Commons last Thursday, Mr. Robert Stanfield reiterated yesterday his firm determination to fight to the finish against the proposed changes to the Standing Orders, which appear on this page.

The debate on that matter has taken up a good part of the time of the house for some fifteen days. Now, it is obvious that the new proposal (especially rule 75c) is only a finer redrafting of another proposal—rule 16A—which incurred last December the proper censure of parliament and public opinion. Consequently, it deserves exactly the same fate as its unfortunate predecessor.

Mr. Claude Ryan is unequivocally blaming the new attempt of the President of the Privy Council who would like to reinstate standing order 16A repudiated last December.

Further, in his editorial, Mr. Claude Ryan stated, and I quote:

—Let us note by the way that standing order 75B rests on the principle of agreements reached "by a majority of the representatives of the several parties" and does not provide any special status for the government party. Was it done on purpose or was it an oversight on the part of the government? Anyway, the leader of the government in the house, Mr. Donald Macdonald, has made in this connection an intolerable misuse of authority by trying, through a government motion, to alter the text of the rule in obvious contempt of the will of one of the house committees. Last Tuesday, Mr. Macdonald was forced to yield on that point and he had to give priority to the committee report. But his attitude showed in an alarming way how he considers relations between the government and the house.

[Mr. Ricard.]

Mr. Speaker, opposition members are not the only ones to criticize the approach of the President of the Privy Council, and to think that he is being arrogant; newspapermen are also beginning to believe that we are right and they support us in our present campaign. I continue the quotation:

Notwithstanding their objective value, proposed Standing Orders 75A and 75B unfortunately lose all their meaning when flanked by rule 75c which derives from a very different inspiration.

The first two rules are based on the principle of the fundamental equality of the parties concerned and of their ability to agree freely on procedural matters.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Rule 75c, on the contrary, proceeds from the philosophy of arbitration by an authority, which, in that case, is nothing else than the majority party. That looks like, as stated in the house by Mr. Knowles, a negotiation in which one of the parties, while recognizing itself equal to the others, would secure the right of being able to impose on them compulsory arbitration.

This is what Mr. Claude Ryan, an editorialist whose competence is acknowledged throughout the country, thinks of the proposal of the President of the Privy Council.

In his article, Mr. Ryan writes also the following:

Beyond the stands that are opposed, a further matter is of interest. Why did the government choose to revive at this time a proposal which was clearly defeated in December last and which since that time has made no progress in the public opinion?

One argument could have justified the government's attitude, the one he would have had if these last months the opposition parties had indulged in sterile filibustering. But according to numerous observers, it is the opposite which took place. Thanks to the reasonable co-operation of the various parties, the Commons have been operating at a much improved speed for the last few months. In many cases, there was agreement to limit considerably the duration of certain debates.

Not only are we the only ones, Mr. Speaker, to be able to say that we reached agreement, but many newspapers recognize that fact. In general, they admit that under our leader (Mr. Stanfield), we have given much proof of our sincere desire to improve and speed up the way things are done in the house. As members of the opposition in this house, we have a mandate and an obligation towards the population.

We do not make representations to the house only in the interest of the opposition, but because we are much concerned with the best interests of the Canadian people. I think it is high time for the hon. members opposite, for the government and for the members of