

Senate and House of Commons Act

consider that the Member has strayed from the subject matter of the Bill and that he no longer is relevant to the Bill.

Mr. Gauthier: He is speaking to the motion.

Mr. Nunziata: The Member by moving his motion has precluded me from speaking to the Bill. Indeed, I am speaking to the motion. I am trying to point out that the New Democratic Party's motion to invoke closure is hypocritical and that it is reflective of the actions of the Party to my left.

Mr. Mazankowski: Right on.

Mr. Nunziata: The New Democrats say one thing out of one side of their mouths and they say something else out of the other side. I was using the example of the Hon. Ian Deans.

Mr. Mazankowski: He is not an honourable.

Mr. Nunziata: A former Member of this House and a member of the New Democratic Party of Canada.

Mr. Parry: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In listening to the Hon. Member who is speaking, will you first review the application of the rule of relevance? Second, will you advise this House whether such an infantile personal diatribe against a former Member is admissible under any circumstances?

Mr. Beatty: It is messy when a marriage breaks up.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that you have ruled that my comments are relevant. I am speaking to the motion. I am pointing out the hypocrisy of the motion itself. Once again, I have chosen to use the case of Ian Deans as an example to illustrate the hypocrisy of the socialists to our left.

Mr. Parry: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The previous speaker stated that you, Sir, had made a ruling. Is he in order in imputing a ruling when you have made no such ruling?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry) dealt with the fact that the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) was making comments on the nomination of Mr. Deans, comments which I am allowing to a certain extent. One of the considerations is that recently we heard comments made by another Member of this House on the nomination of Mr. Camp. I would not want the whole debate to deal with the nominations of either Mr. Camp or Mr. Deans, but I am willing for a few minutes to entertain some comments about their nominations.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party, which includes Mr. Deans, stood up on many occasions and complained about patronage. The New Democrats purport to represent the working class, the poor and the

downtrodden in society. They speak in a very self-righteous fashion about the disadvantaged in society. I ask the New Democratic Party how many of those downtrodden have a Government job that pays \$93,000 a year.

Mr. Beatty: Ian Deans does.

Mr. Kaplan: Plus.

Mr. Nunziata: Plus a pension. It is one thing to accept a Government job but it is another thing to accept a Government job together with not one pension, not only his House of Commons pension—

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know why the Hon. Member is trying to hold up a Bill that will save at least some money for the Canadian taxpayers. I wish he would stop filibustering a Bill which is obviously designed, even though it is a symbolic gesture, to save at least some money for Canadian taxpayers. Is the Hon. Member just looking after his own skin?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This being not necessarily on that point, but I would like to advise the House that once the motion being debated is "That the question be now put", the debate may continue on the original question.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely hilarious that the Member should talk about saving money. If we want to save money, why does the former Member for Hamilton Mountain not forgo his pension? My colleague here says that the former Member for Hamilton Mountain was double dipping, but he is triple dipping. Not only is he getting a salary of \$93,000 as Chairman of the Public Service Commission, he is also receiving a Government pension from the House of Commons, which is about \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year, and he is also receiving—and listen very carefully—a pension from the provincial Government in Ontario.

Mr. Gauthier: None of them are here.

Mr. Nunziata: The New Democrats have all left, Mr. Speaker. There is not one single, solitary New Democratic Member of Parliament—I cannot comment on the presence or absence of Members. They are so embarrassed they left the House and are hanging their heads in shame.

● (1240)

Enough said about the NDP. Let me now speak for a few moments about the hypocrisy of the Conservative Government as shown in Bill C-20. Who is the Government trying to kid? It argues that Bill C-20 is meant to show to the people of Canada that we parliamentarians are leading by example in taking a \$1,000 cut in pay. What are Canadians saying? Big deal. They are asking, if the Government is sincere and honest, why not take effective measures to lead by example? If it is concerned about the salary of Members, why not propose that they be reduced to the poverty level? I challenge the Government. If it is true to its word, then let it bring in a motion to