

Point of Order—Mr. Waddell

left the House. However, at one point he said that I had reacted with glee to the news of cutbacks in post-secondary education. He should better have said that I reacted with grief. As I do, the Secretary of State comes from a city with large numbers of students, universities and community colleges—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is debating. She is continuing the debate, and that is not a point of order.

MR. PAPROSKI—LOTTERIES—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT FROM MINISTER

Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order in reference to the remarks the Secretary of State (Mr. Regan) was supposed to make today telling us what he is going to do with the \$32 million he is getting from the provinces with respect to lotteries.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

MR. WADDELL—SUGGESTED IMPOSITION OF PENALTIES FOR LENGTHY QUESTIONS

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the remarks you made in relation to the length of questions. I wonder why we cannot apply the rules of hockey and give penalties when people ask long questions; in other words, they should not be allowed to ask supplementary questions. I suggest Your Honour might do that. Our party used to be allowed four questions. It is a long way down here and, if hon. members to my right continue to abuse their privileges by asking long questions, we will not be able to ask four questions. I respectfully suggest that Your Honour apply the rules of hockey and impose penalties. I will sit down. That will be the first penalty.

Mr. Nielsen: Send him to the showers!

Madam Speaker: It has happened that members of the New Democratic Party have been allowed to ask four questions in the course of the question period, but that has only been when all questions have been extremely short. I try—and I have statistics to substantiate this—to allow exact proportions of questions to the opposition parties as related to their numbers in the House. We could add another factor and speak of presence in the House, but I think that would be terribly unfair because when members are not in the House, that does not mean they are not working toward the accomplishment of their responsibilities. They might be in committees or somewhere else. So I do not think any kind of penalty—if I am allowed to use that word—should be applied in such circumstances. However, I do try, and the proportion is absolute.

If all questions were shorter, I am sure I could sometimes allow four questions to the New Democratic Party. What is happening in fact is that the Conservative Party is allowed three times more questions than the New Democratic Party. However, sometimes when questions are too long I have to proceed on the basis of time rather than numbers because I

cannot penalize the New Democratic Party if its members' questions are short and when questions from the Conservative Party are too long. I have statistics on that. They are absolutely clear.

When hon. members rise and I do not recognize them, I keep a carry-over list. Once in a while I let the list go, but from week to week I keep a carry-over list and I try to recognize those who rise several times unsuccessfully. That is the situation respecting questions in the House, but I urge hon. members to make their questions shorter.

Mr. Paproski: And answers.

Madam Speaker: Members of Parliament who were in the House ten years ago say to me that they do not recognize the House because we do not have questions any more, we have statements. I think we would be better off if we followed the Standing Orders, which say that questions should be brief and should be made to elicit information.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I have just one sentence by way of a suggestion to the Chair. The Chair might also—and I am sure it will—urge ministers to keep their answers short and not in the form of statements.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: If I may add very briefly to what my learned colleague has just said, replies could sometimes be shorter, but there is so much shouting on the side of the opposition that we are not able to say what we have to say and before replying we must wait for the opposition to stop shouting.

Madam Speaker: I must say that there is heckling on both sides of the House. Sometimes the disturbance comes from one side and sometimes from the other.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, you have just said what I was going to say.

MR. TOWERS—PROCEDURE RESPECTING S.O. 43 MOTIONS

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of clarification respecting Your Honour's comment in which you suggested that perhaps I was out of order. It has never been my intention to be out of order, but I want to know in what respect I was out of order and if there is something in the Standing Orders which prohibits a member from finishing two lines which rhyme in order to make a point.

● (1520)

I could have suggested that cabinet ministers are abusing privileges with three of them flying in separate jets to Winnipeg. No doubt they feel it is a government perk, but it certainly gives the taxpayer an awful knee-jerk. This is the point. If I am in error, I want to know where I am in error so