

frustrated and finds disrespectful the petty scheming of the Deputy Prime Minister. You may be assured, Mr. Speaker, that this will have a serious effect on our attitude towards the Government and the Chair, because we will make sure in the future that we will not give up an inch because as it is often said: once bitten twice shy. However, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House will have the opportunity to reflect on the matter during the Easter holiday and even if Easter is supposed to induce generosity, I can tell you that we will not forget it and things will not be easier on our return. The one who will surely most suffer about it is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs because his contrivance is not consistent with the principles of equity, fair play and give-and-take which should be enforced in the parliamentary process. Mr. Speaker, if we ignore these principles, there is always a price to be paid. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has already paid the price in full view of the people of Canada, and we are certainly not going to make things easy for him, because if that is how he operates, Mr. Speaker, we can play that game too, and if he wants to break the rules, Mr. Speaker, two can play at that game.

I would therefore ask the Chair to reflect on these matters and help us restore a semblance of equity to this House, because I must admit that the effect of today's proceedings has certainly not been to make us feel that the principles of consideration and fairness are alive and well in this House.

[English]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to add much to this debate today, only to preface some of my remarks by saying that the rules of any institution, or any set of rules, are only as good as the players. If people choose not to follow the rules but to use other reasons for their conduct, then we will not be able to proceed as we ought to in any situation.

● (1700)

I would like to refer to Citation 81 in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition under the heading Raising a Question of Privilege. Just before four o'clock today, on behalf of a very serious matter we discussed in caucus earlier, I rose on a question of privilege. Citation 81 reads as follows:

By its nature, a question of privilege is of such importance that it may be raised at any time, and S.O. 17 makes provision for the precedence of a question of privilege over all other business of the House.

I am fortunate enough to sit in the front benches and I have a loud voice. When I rose today, I felt that I was completely ignored. It is clear to me what a question of privilege is and when it should be recognized. I find it very difficult to understand why the decisions made today were in fact made. I respect them, but it seems to me that raising a question of privilege, according to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, is clearly something that ought to be recognized at all times.

Mr. Speaker: Just by way of comment, I have listened very carefully to the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis), who I think is very well respected in this Chamber. Without making a ruling now, I would just comment that the

Time Allocation

general rule in most cases is that unless a question of privilege arises out of the proceedings that are taking place right at the moment, there is, in the usual course of events, notice. However, I will try to deal with all of these things when I respond to the points that are being made.

I wonder if Hon. Members would let me note that there were some points that have not yet been made with respect to some Hon. Members and their votes or lack of votes during the division. Perhaps someone could alert those Hon. Members to the fact that I would be pleased to hear from them on those points. In the meantime, we will carry on with the point of order and I will hear Hon. Members.

Mr. Della Noce: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I do not want to get into debate, but I would like to make a point about the remark made by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall), who said: "What do you expect from a used car dealer?" I have been a used car dealer for the last 20 years, Mr. Speaker, and it is one of the most honest things I could do to serve my community. I can tell my hon. friend that I was so honest that I still have all my hair, and I never had a complaint and I brought my family up. I am proud to see that there are some car dealers present in the House, and I think it is an honest job. Everyone has a car. There are more than 22,000 used car dealers in Canada who will be offended by that remark. In my riding, there are many car dealers who will be offended. I personally am offended and I am sure my hon. colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), is as well.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, my health does not permit me to argue with the Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) who I must say has given a most despicable performance in the House today by giving a—

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members have been rising on a point of order after an incident in which very strong feelings were expressed. I notice that at the wish of the Chair, Hon. Members have been addressing themselves more and more explicitly to the actual point that I must consider. I would ask the Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce) to leave his remarks where they are. He has expressed, with I think some sincerity and certainly some knowledge, his feeling that people who deal in the motor vehicle trade are respectable Canadians. I think perhaps that is where we can leave it.

I just might say that for centuries there have been opinions about lawyers and none of them have been very complimentary. Lawyers are quite used to being assailed by writers, comics, sometimes politicians, clients and the public. Shakespeare was very aware of this when he said in one of his plays: "The first thing we do, let's hang all the lawyers".

Perhaps I cannot rise in defence of lawyers but I can rise in defence of people in the retail motor vehicle trade. I notice that