

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Members in all parts of this House have spoken today in mellifluous language on behalf of the rights of women and about International Women's Day. Members of the government have done so. Outside the House the greatest of ejaculations have been uttered in favour of women. When a member of parliament tries to move a resolution, however, it is turned down because of a rule which is unjust and unfair.

I mention this because the time has come when Canadian people should realize that it is impossible to get resolutions before this House because of one member. I do not say in this case that the hon. member was speaking for himself because he spoke for the Government of Canada by virtue of his position as a parliamentary secretary. However, he has turned down the women of Canada, and they are being deceived. They think parliament turned them down. Parliament did not turn them down. It was the Liberal government through a parliamentary secretary acting for the Liberal party.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The right hon. gentleman is raising by way of a question of privilege the operation of a rule of the House which has not, to my knowledge, in any way been transgressed. The rule reads fairly clearly that a motion can be moved with unanimous consent. It is the right of any member to withhold his consent, and I am not sure that it is the right of any member to comment on the withholding of that consent or to identify people. It may be an impropriety to comment on a proper invocation of any rule.

● (1552)

I wonder if we are anywhere near a question of privilege in discussing the unfortunate effects of a rule which is operating the way it is written on the books. It may be appropriate to move to change that Standing Order, but I have grave reservations, first, if it can be done by privilege, and secondly, unless there is some impropriety in the exercise of the rule, if it is proper to make reflections on the invocation by any member of this House of any Standing Order so long as he is doing so in the proper way.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I have been here a while in this House and I have never seen anything to equal what is happening today. I am simply pointing out to the women of this country that what happened was the voice of the Liberal party, hypocritically on the one hand supporting women's rights, and in the House of Commons denying the statement. Your Honour rules that that is not a question of privilege, and I accept your ruling as I always do. I simply put it on the doorstep of these people with their hypocrisy, pretending to the Canadian people that they believe in women's rights, and then preventing discussion in the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

*Privilege—Mr. Diefenbaker*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) for making a suggestion which could be described as what would seem to me to be a constructive intervention. I have a lot of respect for institutions and I also have a lot of respect for this institution, including the right hon. member for Prince Albert. Theoretically, if one takes the political flavour out of his comments, what he is actually complaining about is a rule—

[*English*]

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** No politics. The politics are from over there.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pinard:** I let the right hon. member talk and he even blamed me for not talking often enough. I think he occasionally talks too often. So I would ask him to have the courtesy to show respect for this institution and let me talk as I have been given the right to do, Mr. Speaker.

I would say it has been obvious for some time now that abuses have taken place with respect to Standing Order 43 which requires an emergency that is not always set forth. Mr. Speaker, you have heard recently motions under Standing Order 43 with excessively long preambles which were sometimes frivolous and sometimes tainted with political partisanship. Motions introduced under Standing Order 43 sometimes contain very positive elements, I admit. As it happens, a motion was introduced today dealing with the status of women and, generally speaking, on the whole, that motion appeared to me, as a private member, to be quite acceptable. However, it included restrictions which would make the government's job very difficult with respect to the proposed business for today because that motion—in which the right hon. member for Prince Albert, probably by inadvertence, omitted to read everything—specifically said at the end, and I remember it quite well, that the committee would have 30 days to report to the House.

This institution wants the government elected by the majority of Canadians to be responsible for establishing the priority of subject matters submitted to this House. If every time a motion proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 must be passed because it includes some good provisions we would never be able to achieve a program serving Canadians and we would deny the right of the government to establish priorities. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this is why I emphasize the necessity for motions pursuant to Standing Order 43 to respect the nature and spirit of this Parliament and to be written in the future with a preamble which will be less binding on the government and not compel us to change the legislative program we must follow to solve the various problems we are facing.