

[Translation]

Mr. Gauthier: There is no problem, Madam Speaker. The Official Opposition began that practice a good many years ago already. As long as the member says so at the beginning of his or her remarks, I think that the Chair, being aware of the situation, can take the appropriate measures. Each member must make clear that he or she intends to share the time with a colleague, otherwise it will not work.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. Member. Indeed, if each member advises the Chair at the beginning of the speech the Chair can keep track of the time. Otherwise the Chair simply cannot signal members, or we will end up in a situation where a member will exceed the allotted time and we will no longer know where we stand. I quite agree, provided of course each member tells the Chair whether he or she will take only ten minutes. There is no problem if the allotted time runs to 20 minutes.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Edmonton East.

[English]

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, at the outset, let me say it is my intention to speak only for 10 minutes, perhaps less. I am sure that will come as a source of considerable joy to the members here today. My colleague from Okanagan—Shuswap may also get in on the debate. I consider it, let's say, an indulgence in the desires of the House.

I would like to say at the outset that like my hon. colleague, the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, I too will attempt to avoid the use of the *h* word. It is not going to be easy but I want you to know that I am going to do my best to avoid that word in addressing what is in fact the nub of the matter before us today. That is, can the Canadian people trust the Liberal party to put their Senate majority where their mouth is. That is the only question before the House today, although for the purpose of the observance of the parliamentary niceties, it was necessary to draft the motion in a somewhat less straightforward fashion.

I would like to suggest that the Canadian people are finding out that no, they cannot trust the Liberals where they have the ability to abolish the GST to do so. They

Supply

can trust the Liberals to rail against it impotently in the House of Commons but they cannot trust the Liberals to use their Senate majority to defeat the GST in the other place. We know that for a fact because of May 3. May 3 was the day on which the other place passed the GST bill at second reading. That was the day on which the Senate, in which the majority of members are Liberals, approved in principle the GST. That is something that all Canadians should remember.

Mr. Horning: There were headlines in *The Toronto Star*.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): I wish that were the case. I wish I could have surreptitiously sneaked into the House this afternoon and could have stood here and held up, although I know it is against the rules of the House, a copy of *The Toronto Star* with a 96-point headline on the front page stating: "Senate Liberal Majority Approves GST". It grieves me deeply that I am unable to do that because to the best of my knowledge no such 96-point headline was ever featured in *The Toronto Star*.

Why that is, of course, must remain a matter of speculation. What must not remain a matter of speculation, however, is the performance of the Liberals in the Senate. They had the chance on May 3 to defeat the GST and let it slip by quietly, rather like a weasel nosing around the chicken coop at night.

There are some in this Chamber who believe that the New Democratic Party seeking the action of the Liberals in the Senate to defeat the GST somehow constitutes an abandonment of the party's principled opposition to the Senate. I would like to assure the House of two things. First, the NDP is in no way lessened in its absolute and fundamental opposition to that other unelected, undemocratic—I must stop myself before I get into territory of perhaps unparliamentary adjectives, Madam Speaker, suffice to say that the NDP remains absolutely opposed to the current other place and given a day's chance would abolish it.

What comes after? What form might some subsequent second house in this Parliament take? That is a matter for legitimate debate. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, as I believe to be the case in other caucuses in this House. In the NDP caucus there is a wide variety of opinion as to what form some future second chamber might take. There is no wavering in our caucus in its absolute