

Laced throughout that House leader's speech are comments like: "This motion is sort of a subtle way of storming the Chair" and "this motion says you are not doing your job properly". We do not accept that. It is against the rules. Those comments themselves are against the rules. The Chair did not stop him. That is a microcosm of a larger problem.

Is it really official New Democratic Party policy followed by elected members in this Chamber that we do not want rules and we do not want a referee, that each party shall discipline its own members? I do not want to be partisan, but I raised a point of order on more than one occasion about two members who voted twice. It is clearly on the record; it is on the tapes. One apologized to the House ultimately. The other never has and there was no discipline.

I remember the day a member of the New Democratic Party walked across the floor of the Chamber with a fish and plunked it down on a desk. There were other sorts of advertising gimmicks here and there. There was no discipline. There was no discipline from the referee and no discipline from the party is to invite escalation.

In Croatia there have been all kinds of cease-fires between the Serbs and the Croatians but there is no referee, nobody with the power or the authority to enforce it. Even if you have the power and the authority but do not use it you invite escalation. There were two recent incidents, a comment on sexism and one on racism. Read the record. The member who invited the comment on sexism appears in *Hansard*. What does *Hansard* say? It says: "An hon. member". It does not identify the person. The comment is simply: "That is not true". They yelled: "That is not true". No action from the referee.

In a basketball game that is like an elbow in the chops. If the basketball referee does not penalize the elbow in the chops, you are going to get a blow to the kidney on the next foray down to the other end. By nature that is adversarial. Our job is the refereeing of society. That is what the Chamber does. It passes laws that govern business. It says yes, it is adversarial, but under these limits. We pass pollution laws that say do not go beyond this limit. We pass the Criminal Code. We are in the business of setting limits in the expectation that limits will be enforced.

Government Orders

I was so mad at the House leader of the New Democratic Party on October 11, 1990 because a statement he made in this Chamber was legally actionable outside this Chamber for a class of people called Conservatives. The Chair took no action. The statement was completed from start to finish. I was not even in town. I raised it and I was asked to back off and solve it behind closed doors. It sits there to this day as part of our records. I brought it in today. The statement is on page 14036 of *Hansard*.

I will give you a couple of examples which talk about Conservatives: "Conservatives want to be above the law". This is just a short statement in our *Hansard*. These are just a few lines of it: "They want to be tipped off to any RCMP criminal investigations into their parliamentary affairs". This refers to Conservatives and Conservatives only in this Chamber. "A few weeks later her colleagues are looking for special laws for Tory MPs. Tories are willing to break all conventions, abuse closure, stack the Senate, and now they want to give themselves special legal privileges. No wonder Canadians have such contempt for this government".

If there is no referee to stop this kind of calumny then it invites retaliation and the institution suffers. There is no greater law. We did a filibuster back in 1980 and I was in my office till three and four o'clock in the morning. I read most of those books on that table in about a 15-day period of time. As a fairly new member I was looking for ways to raise questions of order and privilege in this Chamber to filibuster, to stop the constitutional proposal which made my province full of fifth-class citizens. I felt very deeply about it. Never once did I break a rule of this place, unless it was accidental, not once. The rules allow for obstruction. The rules allow for many things done with decency and responsibility.

That statement on October 11, 1990 was an indecent statement. There are only two basic rules in this place that need to be enforced, and the institution benefits. One is respect and the other is relevance.

When is the last time the rule of relevance was enforced in this Chamber? What relevance simply means is that we set aside time to deal with the topic. Miscellaneous changes to bills or decorum in the House is the topic now. The next one might be an income tax issue. But, if everybody spoke to the topic, debates would be quicker, neater and somebody tuning in could actually listen to a debate on the issue: what is right and what is wrong. If we conducted all of our debates and all of our behaviour with respect for each other as human being