

S.O. 43

That the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce be required to make a statement on motions explaining why, aside from bare-faced political chicanery and expediency, the government decided to go on financing from public funds a project which long since had shown itself to lack economic viability.

Madam Speaker: Presentation of this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

CALL FOR REVIEW OF POSITION ON CONSTITUTION—MOTION
UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Masters (Thunder Bay-Nipigon): Madam Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of positions taken by some premiers and the Leader of the Opposition that the original idea behind confederation was to ensure a double majority for constitutional changes which, if followed to its logical conclusion, would undermine the concept of parliamentary supremacy which has been accepted as a principle by Canadians for 113 years and would lead to a system of government akin to that of the United States, I move, seconded by the hon. member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appolloni):

That this House urges the official opposition to review immediately its constitutional position so as to ensure that it is not advocating for Canada creeping republicanism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: Presentation of this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: There is unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: It is moved by the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Nipigon (Mr. Masters), seconded by the hon. member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appolloni):

That this House urges the official opposition to review immediately its constitutional position so as to ensure that it is not advocating for Canada creeping republicanism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark).

● (1410)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, thank you for recognizing me—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I am not familiar with this situation and I am wondering if the hon. member who proposed the motion—

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): A point of order, Madam Speaker. You had recognized the Leader of the Opposition.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I want to ascertain who has the first right to speak.

Mr. Clark: Surely it is the person who has been recognized.

Madam Speaker: The hon. member who moved the motion sat down and did not seek the floor to speak. I therefore recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We will not have much time to debate this motion now but there are some very important matters which should be put before the House and the people of Canada.

The motion suggests that there should be a review of the constitutional position taken by one party in this House. I would devoutly hope that there will be a review taken by the Liberal party of the policy they are forcing on many of their members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I say this particularly since the motion was apparently motivated by a desire to protect the parliamentary principle. What we are interested in here is the defence of the principle of the supremacy of Parliament in two ways. One way, of course, is to have the Parliament of Canada and our partner parliaments in the legislative assemblies across the country maintain their right to make decisions in the spirit of the partnership upon which this federalism is based and not to have those rights eroded and run around by use of the instrument of a national referendum. This could undermine the essence of Canadian federalism by writing out of any agreement on constitutional change the elected legislatures and governments of any of the provinces.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The second matter which deeply concerns us here is in relation to the rights of Parliament and our ability particularly to deal with constitutional change—

[*Translation*]

—and the determination of the Liberal government and party to deny Parliament, here in the House of Commons and in committees, the right to hold public meetings, the opportunity to have a full discussion on all options dealing with the constitution, the basic Canadian legislation. The joint committee on the constitution has advised us today, as we know, Madam Speaker, of a decision to deny Canadians the right of stating their own views on the Canadian Constitution, on the