

*Government Orders*

That is simply the way an adversarial process works. The member opposite does not believe and has said on many occasions in many speeches that business polices itself. It is the whole party platform that there should be rules and there should be referees out there who enforce the rules. That is where it comes from.

I just threw two or three things on the table about keeping the commitment he talks about. It is lousy. There has been no discipline within his own party for the kinds of behaviour that come easily to mind. If that changes, that is great. It has to be through the Chamber itself and through its rules. If we read the rule book Standing Order 10 says:

The Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order.

We have an obligation to support and encourage the Chair to do just that. That is our responsibility as House officers. That is what I have no trouble with. If the NDP believes that order should be replaced and we should eliminate a referee, eliminate a Speaker, and say that under House orders House officers called leaders and Whips and so on shall do such and such, then let us debate it.

Quite frankly there is not an adversarial relationship in the world where that principle works. Part of what you have as a responsibility when you are involved in a team, in a group, is the morale of the group, the strategy of the group and so on. Yes, one takes advantage of rules. One runs up to the edges of rules. One cannot be responsible for that. One goes to a meeting every morning that does exactly that. It is wrong to say that people must be disciplined if they step over the edge a little bit. That discipline comes from the Chair. The rule book says it. It is true in a court of law.

Can you imagine a lawsuit with two lawyers disciplining themselves about what is relevant and what is not? No, that is why there is a judge in the middle who says no to this and no to that and yes to this and yes to that. The adversarial relationship tries to get the main advantage for the client. That is the nature of this place. Collectively we have to say to the Chair that we want our rules enforced and we as House officers will back you up all the way. If we do not do that the institution suffers.

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the government Whip was on to a couple of key points that I share. One was the point that he made that there are hours and hours of work that go

on in this place, in committee and offices that the people of Canada never hear about. They only see the 30-second clip. From time to time there is almost a contest that goes on in this place as to how I can get a 30-second clip instead of trying to advance a particular cause or a particular policy initiative. Therefore I share the member's point on that observation.

He also made another observation that I thought was interesting. He introduced the fact that maybe there should be some accountability with the media as well. We have this exercise after Question Period that I am sure most Canadians are not even aware of. Members run outside and they troll up and down outside this Chamber hoping that some journalist will come along and they can get a clip for the media, for national television.

I saw today a colleague of mine from Scarborough was brutalized, a man who has worked most of his life on human rights issues and has done it in a very progressive way. He was working on a policy paper where the media actually took words that did not exist in the paper. He referred to things like concentration camps and words and language that my hon. colleague I know did not use because I spoke to him, and now, all of a sudden, the member's three years of hard work is gone out the window because the media is allowed to sort of take and twist things and sort of put them in a certain way.

• (1320)

The member has been around here a long time. Does he have any sort of creative ways or thoughts as to how we can sort of make that national gallery a little bit more focused on the substance of issues that are being debated rather than some of the tactical activity that goes on in here?

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, simply and briefly. I have had a question of privilege in my mind. I used it partially off and on for over 10 years. That series of books about our rules and our precedents says clearly that biased information which brings the institution into disrepute can indeed be a contempt of Parliament and is punishable by Parliament. Cut off his head and put him before a firing squad.

The power exists. We are the highest court in the land. There has to be a will. There has to be a certitude in our minds that the institution is more important than any one of us. We have to take the obligation and the