

*Privilege—Mr. Reid*

this question of privilege, he must have met the rule in this connection.

● (1440)

In the second place, I notice that the hon. member for Windsor West, like the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), was concerned about the quoting of rules which apply in the parliament at Westminster. I submit we do not need to fall back on any of the traditions and procedures of that parliament, but that the rules and practice of our own parliament are a sufficient guide to us in a case of this kind. The third thing the hon. member for Windsor West said in his own defence was that a member of this House, even after a matter had been decided by the House, surely had the right to keep an issue alive. All I can say is this: surely the Senate is the last place one would go in an attempt to keep an issue alive!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** My main concern about the action of the hon. member for Windsor West and any others who might like to imitate him arises from the fact that my hon. friends and I believe in democracy. We believe in the authority of this House because we are elected by the people to concern ourselves with the affairs of the country, and for an elected member to go to plead his case against this House before a non-elected body is, I submit, a denial of the principle of democracy. I hope that other hon. members who believe they have a right to follow suit will think twice before they do so.

It is no secret that I do not regard the Senate as having moral authority in our parliamentary system, and it is because my hon. friends and I take this view that we think it is wrong to have dealings with that House or its committees in the manner indicated by the hon. member for Windsor West. The hon. member commented that if it was wrong for him to go over there, why was it wrong for a minister to appear on the floor of the Senate or before a Senate committee. The hon. member is a lawyer and I am surprised he does not appear to be aware that there is a Standing Order of the other place permitting ministers to appear on the floor of the Senate or before Senate committees. But there is no rule or any formal arrangement for private members to go over there. My hon. friend from Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), in his usual profound and succinct way, has just stated the whole case by saying: "It was dumb for him to go". When this parliament was set up—

**Mr. Gray:** Would the hon. member permit a question? A few moment ago he referred to a Standing Order of the Senate. Do I understand that a man with his view of the Senate is citing an order of the Senate?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I am glad to find that my view of the Senate is well known. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that even though I have no use for the Senate as an institution, I have the right to ask the Senate to abide by its own rules.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

**Mr. Fairweather:** In support of your own weak argument.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The rules of the Senate are definite enough when prescribing the conditions under which its own members and staff may come to this House. The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River read from Standing Order 104, to be found on page 50 of the latest edition of the rules of the other place. This is not something out of the Middle Ages; this bears the date December, 1969. This is what the other place has set down in its rules regarding members of that place who come over here without permission of the Senate. I shall not read the whole of the Standing Order. I like this one, though:

104(3) Without such leave, a senator, officer, clerk or servant of the Senate shall not, on any account, under penalty of being committed to the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod or to prison during the pleasure of the Senate—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

—go down to the House of Commons, or send his answer in writing, or by counsel to answer any accusation there.

Note, they always put it that way—"go down to the House of Commons": they do not say "go over". If that is the attitude of the Senate toward one of its own members coming over here, I suggest the Senate should treat our members in the same way and not invite them to go over there. There is, of course, the rule which provides that a minister of the Crown may appear over there. But there are no rules which provide for individual members of this House to go to the other place.

Our parliament was set up with the two Houses placed on a formal arm's length relationship to each other. The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River has cited Standing Order 22 of our rules and Standing Order 50 of the Senate rules. I do not wish or need to repeat them. These are the rules which provide for the course to be followed when there is disagreement between the two Houses. That disagreement has to be a disagreement between the Houses as such; we take our decision here, they take their decision there, and when we do not agree there are arrangements for messages to be sent back and forth, for conferences, and so on. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what sort of chaos would we get into if every time a bill in this House is passed in the face of a considerable body of objection, all of those in this chamber who do not like it were to traipse over there—

**An hon. Member:** That is up to the Senate.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We in our party won't do it because we have no use for the other place. But am I to understand that if the Conservatives vote against clause 4 of Bill C-49 when it comes before us this afternoon, and if they lose and the bill carries with that particular clause in it, every one of the 95 Conservatives would try to go to the Senate or appear before a Senate committee to try to get their Honours to agree that the view of the House of Commons was wrong?

The right to appear before the Canadian Manufacturers Association, the Canadian Bar Association or any of these