

record. I am sure that there will be other Members who might think that it has something to do with the strategy with respect to free trade, in delaying the House—

Some Hon. Members: No.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Thacker:—that his interest only lies between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. I know, from my long friendship with him, that it is of great interest, and I think that the House would be interested in some of the more interesting Bills that he has put. It shows the breadth of his interest in the affairs of this nation.

For example, on September 11, 1987, he put forward a Private Member's Motion, "that, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of working with the provinces to require houseboats and other large marine craft to be equipped with holding tanks with gray water. I had never heard the phrase "gray water" in my entire life. I look forward to the debate to find out just what that actually includes. But it shows that my friend opposite is interested in gray water.

On April 25 of this year he urged also that the House urge all Members of Parliament to fill out their own annual income tax returns so as to serve as a direct reminder of the increasing length and complexity of these forms. I was under the impression that he was opposed to corporal punishment. Surely, having to fill out our own form is practically a capital punishment, certainly a corporal punishment. I will be interested in following his comments in that debate. It would seem to be rather intrusive.

Here is another one. June 15 of this year, a Private Member's Bill, second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-296, an Act establishing a moratorium on the continuing development of nuclear power in Canada for the purposes of establishing a public inquiry. That takes courage, because the Province of Saskatchewan has enormous resources in uranium and very much wants to exploit it. He has Members from his own Party who may have a different view on it, in view of the fact that there are so many jobs in Saskatchewan.

There is also a cost, I suppose, of burning petroleum products or coal, in terms of the carbon dioxide. But it shows his breadth of interest, that he would ask this Parliament would debate that issue. He should be encouraged to carry on.

Here is another one. July 20, 1988, second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-310, an Act to amend the Criminal Code dealing with cattle rustling and range cattle. Presumably that is to put some degree of stability into the handling of rustlers. I know in my riding what they do with rustlers, and it has to do with tops of tin cans, and there are not very many repeaters when a cattle rustler is caught out on the range in my riding.

Here is another one. July 27. Let us just skip that one. I do want to address the Bill. Here is one on August 10, 1988,

Financial Institutions

second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-313, an Act respecting senior citizens. On the face of it, that might be a licensing provision, a registration provision, it might be to grant them goods. I can hardly wait for it to be called so I can find out just what my friend opposite has in mind with respect to senior citizens. I hope it is not to abolish them or to do something like that. Here is the most interesting of all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is very interesting, but I will please ask that the Hon. Member for Lethbridge—Foothills speak on the Private Member's Bill that the Member for Kamloops—Shuswap introduced today. I know that he introduces many, but we are supposed to speak about the one today.

Mr. Thacker: Thank you. I accept your admonition, Mr. Speaker. I will move straight away to Motion No. 143. I certainly share the concern of my friend opposite with respect to the issue of consumer protection in the financial sector. I would think that it is similar to the last motion that he put forth to the House on August 15; second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-315, an Act respecting Magna Carta Day. I thought that that was an interesting Bill because I know his Party as a whole is really opposed to the principle of the Magna Carta, which was the entrenchment of property rights.

Here we have the House Leader of the New Democratic Party having the courage—and it takes courage to stand against that Party, because it did not permit a free vote on capital punishment, that Canadians wanted—

An Hon. Member: Yes, it did. We voted as we wanted to. We voted free on that one.

An Hon. Member: Shame, shame!

Mr. Thacker: It did not permit a free vote on the abortion issue. It would not permit a free vote on the entrenchment of property rights. Here we have the House Leader with courage, standing up and standing against his Party—

An Hon. Member: He is in favour of property rights.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap on a point of order.

● (1750)

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I always listen with interest to my hon. friend, but I thought I should say for the record that the points he makes about not having a free vote on capital punishment, property rights and abortion, is incorrect. They were all free votes. There was never any indication from the leader or the Party that members were required to vote in a certain way. I know it is surprising but we are a small caucus and it just so happens on certain issues there is a unanimity of feeling. What might have appeared to not have been a free vote was in fact a free vote and Members could dissent if they wished.