

Time Allocation

Mr. Nowlan: If you are going to get that personal, you will have to take it too.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps Hon. Members would leave it to the Chair to decide what is—

Mr. Gauthier: Two years to go, Pat, the longest two years our guys will ever see.

Mr. Rossi: Go back to sleep.

An Hon. Member: Don't lose your hair over it.

Mr. Speaker: I ask all Hon. Members, unless they have the floor, to constrain themselves, please. The Hon. Member has the floor and the Chair is listening to the Hon. Member. I ask Hon. Members to co-operate in letting me listen.

Mr. Dingwall: As I was saying, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier rose and shouted to the Chair to be recognized. In addition, the House Leader of the New Democratic Party did likewise. For whatever reasons, the Chair chose not to look. Either the Table Officers did not inform him, intentionally or unintentionally, but Members rose on questions of privilege and points of order which they believed, and still believe, were important. For whatever reasons, the Chair chose to recognize the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre).

You well know, Mr. Speaker, as a result of your ruling yesterday in this Chamber, that the Bill on which the closure motion has been put to the House evoked a great deal of emotion on all sides, so much so that numerous amendments have come forward, some at the legislative committee and most, if not all, at report stage of Bill C-22.

I find it to be particularly odd in view of all the circumstances—the rising of the Minister, your having quick access to information to support your decision, the refusal to recognize Hon. Members who stood in their places and begged for the attention of the Chair, and nothing happening from the Table to inform the Speaker as to who was trying to seek the floor. All these events are quite annoying, in view of what was said yesterday in the ruling in terms of the common sense, fairness, and civility you wished to have in the Chamber.

I am ashamed to have to rise and speak the way I am. This is an important piece of legislation. For Hon. Members opposite to construe as they have this particular course of action, I find to be despicable.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief, but I do not know how sweet. I am not very happy about what I have been exposed to this afternoon.

I did not intend to participate in this question of privilege. I understand the opinions on the Bill. Quite frankly, Hon. Members opposite may be very surprised at even how I may finally vote on the Bill.

I am absolutely bothered, as we head toward the Easter recess, to hear the sham and hypocrisy we have heard in the House this afternoon on what occurred about an hour ago.

The reason I am standing is not a result of the remarks of the last speaker who got most personal. I uttered from my seat some personal remarks too, which do not make me happy. However, when one starts to reflect upon the backgrounds of Members of Parliament in an attempt to support one's argument and starts to reflect upon the heritage of Members of the House, it shows how weak the argument is.

I would say, never having been a used car salesman but having been from the last of the priesthoods, the law, that used car salesmen in the country most likely are held in higher repute than lawyers, in view of all the shysters in the world.

I am completely and absolutely horrified that a colleague from Nova Scotia would stoop to such low tactics when he has the ability to conduct himself in a logical way. However, that was not the reason I rose, although I was listening. I rose because—and I am glad he is here—the crown prince of self-righteousness, the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom), tried to pull the shrouds of experience by standing in his place and piously saying: “Mr. Speaker, I never saw this happen before. I never saw a Minister recognized when Members of the Opposition were standing on points of order, questions of privilege”. They were points of garbage.

I will update the Yorkton—Melville prince of righteousness, the Prince Dauphin of the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan that he would like to be. With three more years in the House than he has, with 21 years in the House, I understand the frustration of Hon. Members opposite. Frankly I do not know if I have made the transition. I am not in the Government. I am not in the Opposition. I am just a government back-bencher.

I understand the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) whom I respect thoroughly. However, his argument falls flat on its face. He referred to the “passions of this debate”. Why not let the debate get on? That is what the Minister wants, and we use procedural tactics perhaps to bring it into focus.

As I said, the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville said that this had not happened before. I sat where my hon. friend sat for many years, and often I would rise on a question of privilege, sometimes real, sometimes sort of suspect. Sometimes it was a political question of privilege. Sometimes it was a real point of order. Sometimes it was sort of a partisan point of order. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, what happened? The Speaker sometimes recognized me, whether he or she—usually she didn't because I never got along with that Speaker—

● (1650)

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: I certainly had problems with other Speakers, Speaker Jerome, for instance. Speaker Lamoureux was my