

The one that worried me the most and which had some historic flavour, because it was in 1962 when the then member for Eglinton, and others who were around here and to one of whom I was vicariously related, was that one relating to the minister who did then, obviously with a little more purity, what this minister of finance did last night. I thought the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance was going to refer to that a little more strongly, but there was in that case provision for an eight-day debate on a ways and means motion.

This dispute affects all members, not just frontbenchers. I was not too worried, quite frankly, about whether I spoke on the throne speech debate or the budget debate. Quite frankly, with this back door budget smuggled in by the minister last night, in effect we will not have a budget message presented by him with an opportunity for backbenchers to participate in respect of budgetary matters perhaps until next fall. The pressure is now on my whip to try to fit us in in order to take part in a joint Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and budget debate. I do not care what the rule says.

I am afraid the minister unfortunately did not spend enough time in opposition to appreciate that members of the opposition, especially the backbenchers but on the government side too, have very few opportunities to participate. Hon. members including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who is known for supporting certain issues and not necessarily for making great constituency speeches, paid credit to the fact that there are limitations on backbenchers' opportunities to participate and talk about constituency matters.

It makes it even more reprehensible that the minister at this time smuggles in this back door budget into the Speech from the Throne debate at a time when members, certainly members on the government side, are preoccupied with a fundamentally large question that is to be voted on May 20. We are now going to muddy the debate on the Speech from the Throne with a budget debate when in effect one of the more important questions in the country, which will be voted on in Quebec, has certainly very much taken the attention of members here. We have members standing up and talking about momentous issues, such as sovereignty-association, to say nothing of the usual constituency speeches from new members who are entitled and should have the opportunity to speak for their constituents as brand new members, not talking about budgetary measures.

The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) earlier recited a list of matters in respect of which we are not going to have the opportunity to debate. I would take the matter a little further, Madam Speaker. Those on the other side when they sat over here last December 13 did not have a chance to take part in a debate but had the opportunity to vote during a division. Obviously I did not like the result of that division.

There were things smuggled in last night by the minister who has cloaked himself in royal robes. It was the Queen's birthday just a couple of days ago, and this minister in his solitude status has, in effect, infringed upon the purity of the Queen by, in effect, smuggling a budget speech in under her robes.

Privilege—Mr. W. Baker

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Nowlan: I know he likes to wear kilts, but I did not realize his affinity for the kilt, or the quilt, would let him smuggle in a budget speech under the Queen's robes. But that is what he has done, Madam Speaker.

In a sense, I go further than the hon. member for Yukon. I am almost finished, Madam Speaker. I am trying to impress that it is not the frontbenches on either side who are the only ones involved. There are backbenchers opposite who I am sure wanted to speak today on the referendum in Quebec. They have been precluded from that opportunity by this discussion on a legitimate point of order, regardless of how Your Honour finds.

There are members here who I am sure wanted to make speeches about their own constituencies but cannot. Even if they could they might have been pre-empted because they would have had to reply to this pseudo-budget speech.

This is what has gone on here, Madam Speaker. It is more than just debate. The other side had a chance to vote on division. I would like to see members opposite vote on some of the proposals in this piece of paper. I would like to see members from Atlantic Canada vote in respect of the removal of no special tax contracts for Atlantic Canada. I would like to see any member of any constituency have the guts to face a division on the exclusion of capital gains assistance, in other words, the retirement plans of the farmers in this land who built this country. That is another thing that has happened, Madam Speaker. There is not an opportunity for members to stand up and put their votes where in effect some of the rhetoric is during a budgetary division.

In conclusion, I think this matter comes around full circle. The member for Yukon said there was a little Alice in Wonderland here. I think you were here last night, Madam Speaker. If there was an Alice in Wonderland here—and as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said, this was not Parliament's finest hour—Alice in Wonderland would have been boggled when she listened for three-quarters of an hour to the division bells ringing across the country, with members of Parliament hard at work going to take a meaty division. What was the result? It was 148 to one.

If that is not a reflection of how archaic some of our rules and/or some of our practices are, I do not know what is. With the penetrating eye of television, that sort of action will dissect this place unless we change some of the rules, not just to suit television but to make this a more reasonable place.

What does the resolution of my House leader ask? Does it ask for something extreme, does it castigate the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, or does it include some of the things we could call him, besides Minnie Mouse or anything else you want to call him? I am not going to get involved in appellations. All the motion says is that there is a *prima facie* case here. I suggest and submit in all sincerity that we have taken all this time to try to impress upon Your Honour that there is such a *prima facie* case. That is all we have to