

Adjournment Debate

do not really recognize, at least in the beginning, the importance of the authority of the Chair. I think that was true after the 1980 election. There are probably more incidents of naming in the first year or two of a Parliament than there tends to be near the end of a Parliament when Members have had an opportunity to work together and to understand the importance of chairmen in committees and the importance of the Speaker in the House.

Bill C-245 is a very simple one. It probably has one negative ribbon in that it tells the Speaker that, through the act of naming the Speaker can affect the Member's paycheck. Indeed it is something that we may want to consider. In terms of what we want to do with a Member's allowance or a Member's indemnity, it might be better to have the authority of the House involved. For instance, on a second offence or a repeated disregard of the authority of the Chair, it might be smarter to deal with the issue of indemnity on the basis of a motion which could be considered by the House and voted on by the House.

I am thinking in terms of those very rare situations when Members are suspended for perhaps a week on the authority of the House. Certainly there are many examples in society. The use of money, in this case the withholding of money, would be a publicly visible symbol of the displeasure of the Speaker, should it be, or the displeasure of the Chamber with the behaviour of a Member and what it does to our traditions.

If I listened carefully to my friend across the way in the Liberal Party, and I have had some discussion with the Hon. Member who moved the motion, I think there might be a predisposition on the part of the House to accept the motion which I intend to move. Therefore I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill C-245, an Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act (suspension), be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the Bill be withdrawn and the subject-matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House has heard the terms of the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the main motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Hawkes) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion as amended?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Accordingly the Order is discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there unanimous consent to call it six o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Therefore the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

● (1720)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT—FUNDING OF MUNICIPAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY CANDIDATES IN TORONTO

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Madam Speaker, if you remember back to your high school days, I will bet that you read a lot of books and probably some books by Charles Dickens. Do you remember those wonderful novels by Charles Dickens; *David Copperfield*, *Nicholas Nickleby*, *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Bleak House* and *A Christmas Carol*? I am sure you remember as well the marvellous novel, *Oliver Twist*. I am sure you read *Oliver Twist* but if you did not, I will bet you saw the musical at the movies.

You must remember all the marvellous characters in *Oliver Twist*. Do you remember the scene where young Oliver actually said "Please, Sir, may I have some more"? That was a great scene. You must remember some of the other characters in that novel including Fagin and the Artful Dodger. What is that, Madam Speaker? Yes, you are right, Fagin and the Artful Dodger are actually pick-pockets. They put their hands into other peoples' pockets and took their money out.

Do you know, Madam Speaker, that that is happening to you, I, and every Canadian right now? We are actually having our pockets picked. You know, of course, of whom I am speaking. I am speaking of the artful dodgers of the NDP who are actually picking our pockets right now.

I know that you were as shocked as was I, Madam Speaker, when you heard the story. If an NDP supporter wants to make a financial contribution, not to the federal New Democratic Party but to a candidate in a municipal election in Toronto, that supporter sends the contribution, not to the municipal candidate but to the federal New Democratic Party. The New Democratic Party sends that contribution back to the municipal candidate. The municipal candidate does not get it directly but rather through this roundabout scam through the federal New Democratic Party.

The federal New Democratic Party then actually issues a tax receipt to the contributor for a contribution used not by the