

Time Allocation

the motion at this point. I submit, Mr. Speaker, I could read into the record the figures with respect to the amount of time but, in fact, most of that is referred to in your ruling. I do not believe in repeating things that are already in *Hansard*. In Your Honour's ruling you referred to the amount of time that has been spent on this Bill to date. If I were a member of the Opposition disputing the question of whether or not there should be time allocation, then during this two hours in which I had a chance to debate I would be debating whether or not there should be time allocation rather than trying to split hairs.

I leave the floor with those remarks.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) said that he will leave the floor. I find it extremely arrogant that the Hon. Member should tell members of the Official Opposition and members of the other Party—

Mr. Lewis: I suggest!

Mr. Prud'homme: —how we can use our time. We do not need to be told by the Deputy House Leader—

Mr. Lewis: Just trying to save you from yourself.

Mr. Prud'homme: —how we should use our time. It is as arrogant as the Minister saying: "It will be my way or else". We have had such an experience before. I am sorry to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the events of today will poison for quite some time the relationship that we have with the Chair and with the Government.

I would now like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have to get back to the series of events which took place. We all know that it was at 3.56 p.m. We all know that the motion means two hours of debate. However, we also know that as soon as a vote has taken place there has been a long practice in the House, which I have never seen broken, where a member could get up and say: "I did not vote for the following reason . . .", "I was late, therefore strike my name", or "I have seen a member who had no right to vote therefore he should not have voted". That has always taken precedence as a point of order. More particularly, when a Member of the House such as the House Leader of the New Democratic Party rises on a question of privilege, I submit that surely that takes precedence over anything else, even my point of order.

• (1630)

We saw, in an extreme arrogant and *bouffon* way—and the television will prove what I am saying—the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) bent over and talking into the microphone. You will see that this is not the best day in the House of Commons. I suggest that members watch the television later and see how the Minister introduced his Bill in the most *bouffon* way I have seen in the House of Commons. Before members quarrel with me, I suggest they watch the television and ask if that is how they want to

conduct the affairs of the House of Commons. We do not have lessons to learn—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Côté (Lac-Saint-Jean): You would be so puritan!

Mr. Prud'homme: The Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Côté) says that—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) has the floor and, as a senior member of this place who has a great deal of experience, is certainly entitled to be heard. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record that we have rules in the House and we just want and expect them to be followed.

It is not every day that we see the Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) rise in such an outrage. I have never seen him like that. Some may say that it is a show, but there are shows and there are shows in political life. He was on his feet and the Minister insisted on keeping the floor in order to put the motion which should have been put at least after hearing the question or privilege of the House Leader of the New Democratic Party about the right of a Member to vote or not to vote.

We know that it was 3.56 p.m. and that the Government decided to get rid of this today before six o'clock no matter how it does so. I want to say that the Government may get rid of it, but people at home should know, because I checked with the Chair, that while I am debating I am taking up the two hours. These questions of privilege are taking away from the two hours for the time allocation debate. That is probably why the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader is asking why the time is not used better, but there is a more important matter than a two-hour debate. It is the rules of the House and how we conduct ourselves.

Without a shadow of a doubt, the Speaker must always remain out of the debate. It is for Members of the House to decide on how they want to dispose of matters.

Many abuses by the Official Opposition took place in the past when we were in government. Surely no one can say that we have done so since September 4, 1984.

I can say to the House Leader, my respected friend, that if the affairs of the House are to be run this way he, or whoever takes his place, will have a hell of a time from now on. That is not in the best interest of the Government in conducting its own affairs and it is not in the best interests of the Minister who imagines that he will ram this Bill through the House. That fight is far from over.

I submit that today's events should never have occurred. There are ways in which to conduct the affairs of the House and we know when there is abuse. We wanted to make our point and there was no abuse. I ask my respected friend, the