

hon. member a liar on Saturday or Sunday but that it is unparliamentary to do so on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday is quite unacceptable. The rule respecting this situation applies to the utterances of members of the House of Commons both within and outside the House.

● (1510)

Mr. Diefenbaker: No.

Mr. MacEachen: I would draw to the attention of the right hon. gentleman a very important precedent. Some years ago, if my recollection is correct, he himself rose in the House and clarified for the benefit of the Speaker comments which he had made outside the House. If he was not observing that tradition, why did he do it? It is obvious it would fly in the face of reason and human decency to suggest there is one standard of conduct that applies to members of parliament while they are sitting in the chamber, that here we maintain standards of proper debate, and another, lower standard, which applies once they leave the chamber. That is quite unacceptable—quite unacceptable to me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Whatever standards apply, apply in all places, including the House of Commons, and the right hon. gentleman cannot make a defence by saying it is all right to call a man a liar if you do it while speaking in New Brunswick but it is bad if you do it in Ottawa.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Despite the applause with which that totally unacceptable and illogical statement by the minister has been received, the fact remains that if we on this side of the House were regularly to point out the falsehoods told by members of the government outside the House we would be busy all the time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barnett: Since the President of the Privy Council has seen fit to intervene in this matter in his role as government House leader, and since he has made reference to the standards that should apply both within and outside the House, I suggest that if he has not already done so he should examine the statement in question, as I have done, and perhaps indicate to his colleague in parliamentary terms that, to say the least, he has displayed a mystifying lack of knowledge of the facts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, since we have lost twelve minutes, he might as well lose another one to say that there is only one truth, and that it should be the same inside and outside this House, and that those politicians who have just spoken for twelve minutes have caused us to waste important minutes allotted to the oral question period.

Mr. Speaker, that problem comes back often and it should be referred immediately to the Committee on

Oral Questions

Procedure and Organization for further consideration. But it remains nevertheless that we have once again lost our time, and our Progressive Conservative friends have not yet understood the importance of the oral question period if they amuse themselves as they do.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I understand that Your Honour has agreed to consider this matter and come to a decision. But I must say we have to reject the philosophy of the President of the Privy Council which indicates that there shall be a different standard for members of parliament in the House and outside the House.

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: As I understood him, he suggested it was perfectly competent for a minister of the Crown to follow a lower standard in a statement outside the House than in the House, and that I reject completely.

Mr. Danson: Mr. Speaker, I do not consider myself to be an expert on the rules of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Danson: But having listened to the intervention by the right hon. member for Prince Albert I realize the immense respect we all have for the precedents set by the mother of parliaments. There they are not so much concerned with a lie outside the House but they certainly have been dealing with a lay outside the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

An hon. Member: Boo!

Mr. Bell: Same old bunch!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members can see now where this kind of insinuation leads. I would think hon. members should be prepared to accept the rulings of the Chair. I have tried since I have been in the chair to guide hon. members to the best of my ability—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: —in the use of what I consider to be parliamentary language. I think that hon. members, by and large, from day to day over the years have been very respectful of the rules and that in general we have set a very good example, as we ought to do—I feel very strongly about this—to other legislatures, to municipal councils and other parliamentary bodies. I believe hon. members should always bear this in mind. They should consider that it is part of their responsibility in this House to set a good example not only to other hon. members and to the general public but also, as I have said, to other parliamentary institutions. In this sense I suggest it is fitting they should adopt the highest possible standards. When we start making distinctions as to whether we can call a member a liar when he makes a statement outside the House but we cannot do it about a statement he makes inside the House we are splitting hairs and we are not acting in conformity with the spirit of the rules. The spirit