

The British House of Commons, which is the patriarch of parliaments, has adopted procedures which permit members to defeat a government motion without necessarily defeating the government as a result of the backbenchers in the British system exerting their constitutional rights and responsibilities.

Would the Prime Minister at least consider instructing his House leader to study the possibility of adopting such a procedure here and reporting the results of such a study to the House at the earliest possible convenience?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is accurate in terms of what should constitute confidence motions. I would also suggest to her that if we are going to get to this question of individual members being free to express their views, we are going to have to get at the question of partisanship and party blocs in the House.

For example, in the British system all members, backbenchers and opposition, have an equal opportunity to ask questions. They are selected by lot. We would have to start there. We would have to change our voting system, but I think that would be an improvement. I would be willing to engage in those kinds of discussions.

* * *

MAPLE LEAF FUND

Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

The Maple Leaf Fund in western Canada, approved by the minister of immigration, has been exposed by the media as being nothing more than a front for a Winnipeg Tory fundraiser who has taken advantage of investor immigrants to build up his business empire.

Will the minister indicate to the House that the government will put an immediate stop to this abuse and protect new Canadians from Tory bagmen?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I simply do not accept the premise of the question.

Let me say that the government has introduced the investor program as a way of ensuring that in different regions of Canada there is access to investment funds

Government Orders

through the immigration process. We have maintained high standards of monitoring on this program throughout.

The economic benefits of each particular fund are determined by the provinces, and everyone who functions as an investor immigrant is subject to the securities laws of provinces.

I simply do not accept either the premise or the conclusion that the hon. member states.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of order to ask that you rule that Motion No. 30 on the Order Paper before the House is in whole or in part improperly before the House and in whole or in part is out of order.

My concern is centred on two distinct elements of this motion before us. The first is found in paragraph 30, which proposes to amend the right of the Crown to debate Supply before it is granted to the Crown.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if I could say to the hon. member for Kamloops that I will hear him in a moment on the point of order.

Mr. Andre, seconded by Mr. Epp, moves:

That the Standing Orders of the House of Commons in force on the date of notice of this motion be amended as follows:

1. That Standing Order 24 be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I should say to the House that the motion which has been brought before the House by the government is a very long one. Hon. members can see that it is nearly an inch thick in pages. The usual convention in this place is that in circumstances like this the courtesies are extended and usually the Speaker is allowed to dispense with the reading of the entire motion.