

Supply

Member for Provencher said the motion had to be passed by the Senate and the House. However, he posed it under a Standing Order that assures that if the motion were carried, Parliament would be immediately dissolved and, of course, there would be no consideration by the Senate of this important question.

● (1250)

The spurious device that he has offered us of somehow avoiding this question on Monday is not possible under the rules. If this motion comes to a vote today, it will be deferred until three o'clock on Monday. At three o'clock on Monday, whatever else the business of the House may be at that time, the vote will take priority. The greatest tragedy of this, with Members of the Opposition so shamelessly playing politics, is that without unanimous consent, they prevent us from considering this question again in this session.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer you to page 328 of Bourinot's. Bourinot's reads:

It is, however, an ancient rule of parliament that "no question or motion can regularly be offered if it is substantially the same with one on which the judgment of the house has already been expressed during the current session". The old rule of parliament reads: "That a question being once made, and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again, but must stand as a judgment of the house".

Mr. Epp: That is why you should introduce it first.

Mr. MacGuigan: The Hon. Member says that that is why we should introduce it first. But this has been introduced first. This has been introduced before we could obtain a reply from the Members of the New Democratic Party.

To continue to quote from page 329 of Bourinot's, it is stated there that:

—when a question has once been negated, it is not allowable to propose it again, even if the form and words of the motion are different from those of the previous motion.

Turning to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Mr. Speaker, reading from paragraph 416, it states:

(1) An old rule of Parliament reads: "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House." Unless such a rule were in existence, the time of the House might be used in the discussion of a motion of the same nature and contradictory decisions would be sometimes arrived at in the course of the same session.

Beauchesne then quotes Bourinot.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these rules make it impossible to carry out the device suggested by the Hon. Members because after three o'clock on Monday when this is voted on, this question, without unanimous consent, will not be dealt with again in the House during this present session.

I do not know why the Opposition would have chosen this course. I can only speculate that it wanted to put the Members of the New Democratic Party on the spot before the election in British Columbia takes place next week. Perhaps that is what motivates the Members of the Opposition. Perhaps the Official Opposition thinks it can persuade the Canadian people that, because Members of this side of the House have to vote against this as a matter of non-confidence, we are not in favour

of the substance of the motion. If that is their motivation, the Members opposite should know that the people of Canada will see through that device as well.

Whatever their intention, it is quite clear that the Members opposite are playing politics. Whether they are playing politics to get at the NDP or to get at our Party, or to get at both, they are playing politics with this issue that they consider to be so sacred, this issue that could have been dealt with effectively during this session of Parliament which they, by taking this parliamentary tactic, have now made impossible.

Mr. McKnight: Do it on Monday. You still have the opportunity to do it on Monday.

Mr. MacGuigan: If the Hon. Member does not understand that this cannot be done on Monday because this motion has to be voted on, which will preclude dealing with any other motion on the same subject, then he should consider this matter further.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I suppose we know now why the Opposition is so sensitive about this question. For one thing, it would wish to avoid the discussion of any other constitutional subjects. Let me refer to the controversy that is going on within the Opposition Party on the question of opting out for Provinces with or without compensation. Mr. Brian Mulroney, one of the candidates for the Conservative Party leadership, says of the views of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark):

"To try to curry the favor of the Parti Québécois organization during a leadership campaign is dangerous to the candidate who does it, it's dangerous for the future of the party he seeks to lead and it's dangerous to the future of the united country he seeks to govern".

Mr. Mulroney said that this week.

The Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead is quoted as replying:

"Perhaps one of the disabilities of not having served in the House is that a man is not fully acquainted with the positions the party took."

Well, I wonder what the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead would say about the positions taken by the Hon. Member for York North (Mr. Gamble), for instance, who takes the same position as does Mr. Mulroney in this debate within their Party. Of course, they would not want to have a discussion like that before Members of the House.

Even more than that, obviously the Members of the Opposition are pretty embarrassed about this situation. The Hon. Member for Provencher said that his Party has always at every stage been in favour of the inclusion of property rights in the protections of the Constitution. Well, that may have a certain logic, but it has no reality, because in fact they opposed the inclusion of all guarantees in the Constitution. They are Johnny-come-latelies as far as the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is concerned. They are trying to jump on the bandwagon now. They say they want the protection of property. They did not want the protection of anything, and it is only