

seen by Canadians as a clear statement by the Liberal party that they favour the GST.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, I am always astounded by the intellectual elasticity of my NDP friends. How they can whistle and suck at the same time is beyond my understanding.

Nevertheless I want to ask a question. We have a motion before us today that says that the Senate should defeat any bill including the GST, the clawback, and the pension bill. The Senate should have the authority to defeat any bill that comes before the House. Then we have on page xiii of today's Order Paper a motion in the name of the hon. member for Kamloops opposing the estimates. It says:

Notice is hereby given of opposition to Vote 1, in the amount of \$27,605,000 under Parliament—The Senate—Program expenditures—

In other words, on May 31, two or three days ago, the New Democrats wanted to take all the money away from the Senate. Today they are telling Canadians that they want to tell the Senate to defeat the bill.

Where do members of the NDP stand? I know they do not have much of a stand on anything. We always think they are either coming or going somewhere, but are they for the Senate, for the Senate's money or not? If they are not for it, okay. If they are for no budget, how can you operate without any money? If they are not for having a budget how can we have this motion today, which would be consistent? How about some consistency in the debate for a while?

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** Madam Speaker, I am indebted to the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier for raising that most cogent and praiseworthy motion by our hon. House leader to abolish the budget of the Senate. It is utterly consistent with the policy of the New Democratic Party which is to abolish the other place as currently it stands. I do not want anybody in this House to harbour any doubts in this regard. The NDP unequivocally favours the abolition of the current Senate, without any exception or reservation whatsoever.

In this as in so much else we have, it must be admitted, experienced a wee bit of difficulty in convincing the rest of you of the wisdom of this position, the case in point being the fate of that very motion at the end of May. We

### Supply

are left trudging along with this sclerotic, nonsensical other place for the time being. That being the case, let me say again that the point of the motion has much less to do with the Senate and much more to do with the Liberal party. As I said at the beginning, what it boils down to is: Will the Liberal party or will the Liberal party not put its Senate majority where its mouth is?

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont):** Madam Speaker, I would just like to read some quotes to show the elasticity of the NDP's position. The hon. member for Edmonton East says that it is utterly consistent and absolutely in favour of abolition. I would like to refer to an magazine article in the *Alberta Report* magazine which reads:

Many in the western wing of the NDP recognize there is widespread popular support in their region for an elected, equal and effective Senate. And Saskatchewan NDP leader Roy Romanow now concedes there is an alternative to abolition.

That is how utterly consistent they are. It goes on to say:

Mr. Romanow, among the four western NDP leaders, seems most willing to consider some kind of Senate reform as an alternative to abolition. But the others appear willing to listen, at least. "I am open to ideas on (Senate reform)", says Mr. Doer.

There are two NDP leaders in the west who are not in favour of abolition but in favour of reform. It goes on to say:

—Mr. Waddell professes to be a Senate abolitionist, but he too concedes that reform is worth considering. Some NDPers are coming to accept that it looks like the Senate is going to be around for a while longer, so we might as well have one that does something.

And it concludes by saying:

Mr. Romanow clearly understands these political realities as well or better than most. "Let's face it", he says, "I've been in politics in Saskatchewan for a long time, and the name of the game is more of a voice for the West".

I would like to have the hon. member respond to these utterly consistent remarks that the NDP has made on this situation.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It will have to be a short rebuttal from the hon. member for Edmonton East.

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** Madam Speaker, as I was to the previous Liberal speaker, I am indebted to this one for raising the obvious fact. I will repeat it, and I hope it sticks this time. The NDP is absolutely, utterly, without exception, consistent in favouring the abolition of the current Senate. What is to replace it? That is a