

Time Allocation for Bill C-11

thinking in the House, his extraneous data or unctuous manner. The unctuous manner in which the hon. member continuously addresses this House is really quite shocking. I find that the hon. member finds it impossible to do anything but rise and delay. Perhaps he will get the ACTRA award this year for the best television performance.

I supported television in this House for two reasons. The first was to inform the Canadian public. Ours is the party that has brought in and made possible television in this House of Commons so that the people of this country will know what is happening within this chamber. My second reason for supporting television was so that the rules of this House would be changed and these inoperable, blunt nineteenth century rules which we insist on using in the House will be changed when the public has looked at this place and seen with what ineptitude the debates grind on.

In Westminster, this bill would have passed seven days ago, yet we continually talk and gather wool around a subject that is only too clear to the people of this country. The people of Canada, looking in on these discussions, will not tolerate further delay, sophistry and repetition. The clear obstructions that are evident as continued regurgitation of the same tired arguments come forth for the third, fourth and fifth time, will not be overlooked by the public of this country. My faith is in the people watching, who will say to us clearly, "Cut the nonsense. Have a sensible debate and make a decision."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to point out that Aimee Semple McPherson, the hon. member for Skeena (Mrs. Campagnolo), does not know the difference between bombast and reason.

Mrs. Campagnolo: Mr. Speaker, I consider that a matter of privilege. The hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) continually makes reference to Biblical ethics. He, of course, is a member of the Biblical cast. He is from a part of the country where this is very much respected and he is very much admired for his feelings. However, to combine my name with Aimee Semple McPherson is a sexist remark which I know the people of Surrey-White Rock, North Delta, would not like to hear.

● (1622)

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate. The Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) (Mrs. Campagnolo) has made her contribution to the debate. The fact is that she has certainly taken the precedent set by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in this chamber and outside by giving us, in her own way, an argument that as far as parliament is concerned, it is rather irrelevant. Also, that as far as the rights of members of parliament are concerned with regard to expressing points of view strongly held about the very pressing issues in our country today, we have no rights and that it is the all-powerful government which is going to sit around and dictate to parlia-

[Mrs. Campagnolo.]

ment precisely what is going to happen in this chamber, and thereby curtail the right of freedom of speech.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: We know that the minister, by putting forward that point of view, is only echoing the position which was taken time and time again by the Prime Minister who likes to think that when members of parliament—as he likes to term it—go 50 yards off Parliament Hill, they turn into nobodies. I am concerned about this government and this group of people who want to manipulate parliament, who want to take parliament and turn it into simply a little, private sounding-board for the cabinet. They are going to provide improvements, as they see it, which will make members of parliament nobodies on Parliament Hill, as opposed to being nobodies off Parliament Hill.

I am going to fight this particular tendency of the government, a government which forgets easily and readily the traditional and proper function of parliament, which is to be a forum for some of us who represent people, or who try to represent people as best we can, to stand up and express the positions they are experiencing and which they take in various parts of our country, the attitudes they take toward legislation which is brought forward, and so on. This is not, as someone said, a sausage factory where the government can bring its legislation and think two hours' debate is fine, and that every four years they will go back to the people, at which time there will possibly be a reassessment of the way in which the government has conducted our affairs.

Parliament has a role to play. Parliament is a forum giving us an opportunity to stand in our place and bring forward, not only criticism of our government but also suggestions. We have a twofold obligation. I am amazed that this move at this point in time is being supported by those on the government back benches who are not members of the cabinet. They have very little opportunity to express their points of view and to bring to the attention of the cabinet the changes which they believe are necessary in the interests of the people of our country.

An hon. Member: We don't complain.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Well, that is a very sad state of affairs. The parliamentary secretary, aspiring as he does to greater things, would naturally go along with almost anything the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) said. We know that if he stood up and really expressed his feelings or the feelings of his constituents, it would very much hinder any chance of advance he has, as far as the motion is concerned, so we always qualify what some of these parliamentary secretaries say with respect to criticism of government policy. We know that their position is one of merely being yes-men to everything that happens as far as the cabinet is concerned.

As a result, they are limited in their ability to speak on behalf of their constituents. I simply say to those who are not parliamentary secretaries that I know how difficult it is for them when they realize there is television coverage of this