

Point of Order

passed unanimously by this House without debate, that therefore makes it an exceptional case.

Mr. Speaker, the absence of debate does not in any way detract from the fact that the House was seized of the motion. The House was given the motion, it was found to be in order and it was agreed to unanimously, even without debate. Nevertheless, the motion was considered to be in order.

There is another case, if my memory serves me right. The hon. member on reflection may want to withdraw his point of order. It seems to me that on another occasion in this House, Parliament made a decision regarding the Moresby Island park in the province of British Columbia. If I recall correctly, not only did the House have such a motion encouraging the legislature of the province of British Columbia to make a decision or to at least be supportive of this issue, I think it too was supported unanimously. Even more important, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe it was seconded by the hon. member for Kamloops who has just brought forward this argument. In fact, if we look at the precedents before this House, including one in which he was an active player—we were all very complimentary of his efforts at that time—his own precedents refute his argument.

• (1520)

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stansstead): Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Kamloops and I should add that the notice as presented not only asks another legislative assembly to ratify an agreement as is but it also suggests holding a second constitutional debate on which this House has not yet taken any position at all. I note, among other things, the following “open the process for Canada’s future constitutional development including the important issues of Senate reform, of aboriginal rights and linguistic rights”. We could talk about the Canada Clause and all these other major amendments to the Meech Lake Accord. So I do not think that we can ask another legislative assembly to take such an approach and basically distort the whole debate that has gone on in eight other legislatures in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I simply want to say in response to my hon. colleague regarding the South Moresby motion in the House that there were actually two differences in that case.

One was that we were calling upon the government for a certain course of action. In other words, it could take that action in any way it wished. We were not calling upon the legislature in the province of British Columbia to act. I think it is quite a different matter to be calling upon a government to take some action or to be virtually committing the legislature to take action.

Second, at that time we were calling for federal-provincial negotiations in order to carry out the establishment of the park.

I want to use this opportunity to say that we remember what happened when the federal House involved itself in the language issue of Manitoba when the premier of that province publicly stated that in no way did he wish the federal government to involve itself in the very sensitive issue at that point. There was animosity and resentment of the infringement upon what they perceived to be their jurisdiction.

I think it is not only dangerous to be horning in on an area where we ought not to tread and where our views are already well known at this point and at the eleventh hour, at a critical point in this very sensitive process, but inappropriate in terms of parliamentary practice.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kamloops has raised a matter of interest.

So that all hon. members can fully understand what is placed in front of the Chair, I draw their attention to the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* wherein the government has indicated by notice of motion placed on the Order Paper that, although it has not been called for debate yet, a resolution relating to the constitutional accord and the results of the discussions of a week or so ago.

I will not read the whole preamble, but I will read the substantive part, which is the basis of the complaint brought to us by the hon. member for Kamloops. It reads:

— the House —