

oppose this most reasonable motion, as many of his colleagues can, and let the matter go through and we will have an election. But we do not want to cause him that trouble. We want the matter dealt with, and that is why we are doing what we are doing today and being very reasonable to boot.

● (1710)

Mr. Ethier: Mr. Speaker, they repeat and repeat all day that we can vote for this motion and that would not be considered a vote of confidence. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), said, you could have introduced the motion as other than a vote of confidence. But you chose to do it this way, and I think you have been misleading Canadians all day. I asked a while ago if Hon. Members were sincere in their motion. I would ask them now if they are honest in that motion. Tell the Canadian people exactly what it is. In voting for the motion, you are voting to defeat the Government. It is a vote of confidence. Say it in those terms. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) is saying it is.

Mr. Blenkarn: We are not voting to defeat the Government. We will defeat you on the Estimates.

Mr. Ethier: The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) is saying the same.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I do not have a blackboard because I would like to put it down in writing. If anyone over there is listening and able to understand simple logic, what we are saying in the proposal put forward is that we can accomplish anything with unanimous consent. As a former Deputy Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary knows that. By unanimous consent we can agree to anything in any procedure we want to. What has happened is that an opportunity was proposed by the NDP, agreed to unanimously by Members of the Official Opposition, for this motion to not be a vote of confidence. A vote would be taken, and if the motion was carried, it would not be considered a vote of confidence in the Government.

I just want to explain one more thing. The Parliamentary Secretary will remember, because he was sitting in his place watching all this, that much to my surprise and probably to the surprise of thousands of Canadians who were watching, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs refused to give unanimous consent, as did the Minister of State for International Trade. It was not indeed anyone on this side of the House, but rather Government Members themselves who refused the opportunity of carrying on with this vote so it would not be a vote of confidence. We did our best, we tried to make it easy for Members on the Government side, but unfortunately their leaders have let them down again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) in debate.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, no.

Supply

Mr. Roger Simmons (Burin-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, they are going to like what I am going to say because this motion is a motherhood statement, and everyone knows that. Please do not tell me that anyone in this House would dare vote against this mouthful of motherhood. Just listen to it, Mr. Speaker:

That the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be authorized to consider and make recommendations upon the subject-matter of Ministers and conflict of interest; and public servants and conflict of interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you who in his right mind, what self-respecting Parliamentarian could be against that particular mouthful of motherhood?

Mr. Blenkarn: You are.

Mr. Simmons: I am. I am against it.

Mr. Blenkarn: You are not self respecting.

Mr. Simmons: I will tell you why I am against it, Mr. Speaker. It is because I know a Trojan horse when I see one, even a clumsily built Trojan horse. I can recognize even a poorly crafted Trojan horse when I see one.

Mr. Lewis: Did one kick you in the arm?

Mr. Simmons: This motion gives itself away, Mr. Speaker, by its very simplicity and sweet innocence. The whole purpose of the motion, we are told, is to have a nice, civil, academic exercise about conflict of interest as it relates to Ministers and public servants. Do they think we are too green to burn over here, Mr. Speaker? Do they really expect us to believe that elementary nonsense? That clumsy obfuscation, that transparent doubletalk from the Tories today, do they really expect us to believe that?

Now, who is the author of this motion, Mr. Speaker? Who is the carpenter foreman who built this Trojan horse? None other than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nielsen), the Hon. Member for Yukon. The kneecapper. Old "kneecapsen" himself. We know his record in this House, his self-appointed smear assignment, his lifelong crusade to undermine, to drag in the mud, to tear to shreds the good reputation of any who dare to call themselves Liberals. That in his eyes is their crime, their only crime. The only required crime. We are asked to believe that the Hon. Member for Yukon crafted this innocent sounding motion for innocent reasons. Of that, Mr. Speaker, he is totally incapable. He is totally incapable of crafting this motion for innocent reasons. That would be absolutely out of character for the Hon. Member for Yukon. Let us see this motion for what it is, for what the Leader of the Opposition intends it to be, a licence to conduct another witchhunt, to unleash the venom, the bile of the Hon. Member for Yukon in the guise of a study by a parliamentary committee.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I for one will not give him consent to do that. I will not acquiesce. I will not aid and abet his vicious and voracious appetite for jugulars. If he has charges to make, let him make them like a man. I invite him to contain his invective. I appeal to him to put a lid on his cowardly and unprincipled innuendo.