Supply

global bill presented to us and then sending us home for another year. I wonder whether the Hon. Member is prepared to comment on the difference between a sitting and a session, and whether the House has not perhaps gone beyond the normal parliamentary session within the terms of the previous Constitution.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I would be among the first to yield to the Hon. Member. He has been here several years and is experienced in Government. He appreciates the rules of the House and what is contained in the Constitution which we have made law in this country. I believe he is familiar with the Act and the rules as they apply to the very question he has placed before us this afternoon. I do not think it is necessary for me to add anything to that. He is a senior Member of the Opposition, so far be it from me to lecture him on the interpretation of sittings and sessions.

It is of no benefit to the country and of no benefit to this institution to be wasting the time of Parliament bringing in silly motions such as the one we are debating this afternoon. It is a delaying tactic. We witnessed that filibuster with respect to the bell ringing incident and the assault on the Chair. If this is all that occupies the minds of Hon. Members opposite, I will not delay the House any further.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. Member, if he finds the motion so silly, why he wasted the time of the House for 20 minutes speaking on it?

Mr. Harquail: This is the very essence of this important place, that we are here to do a job. I was elected to represent a very important part of this country. I am proud to be here representing the riding of Restigouche which I was referring to as my time expired. The Hon. Member knows that there is a certain onus of responsibility on the Opposition as well as on the Government in any democratic system. That is true in Canada. We accept our role and I would only hope that Hon. Members opposite would make our work a little more interesting by appointing Hon. Members to put sufficient time and effort into coming up with some thought-provoking motions which we could really deal with in the time which is allotted to us in the House.

• (1650)

The Acting Speaker: Questions and answers.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Hon. Member's comments and I appreciate very much his concern over the leadership of this Party. I wonder if he has given any thought whatsoever to the total lack of leadership on his side of the House?

Mr. Harquail: Fifteen years ago last Friday we applauded one of the best leaders, one of the most dynamic and competent Prime Ministers the country will see for many years to come. The Hon. Member has given me an excellent opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say something I wanted to say during the course of my remarks, but which I refrained from doing. The very fact things we have been able to achieve, arising out of the Speech from the Throne, have been achieved as a result of the dynamic leadership of the Prime Minister. We are very proud of this fact. I am very pleased, and must thank my hon. friend from British Columbia, for giving me this excellent opportunity to make the statement that there is no doubt in anyone's mind that the Prime Minister has made the case for himself through his intelligence and his ability to achieve these things.

What I would like to put to the Hon. Member on the other side of the House, though, with respect to comments which have been made this afternoon, is the fact that his party, which plays the role of Official Opposition, and of which he seems to be proud to be a Member, has held three conventions in the last two years and has yet to produce a policy to indicate to the Canadian people where it stands on any issue. Despite the fact that his party has not been able to hold on to a leader, despite the fact that it, after nine months had to give up the Government, and despite the fact that it was not able to govern when given the opportunity, the Hon. Member has the audacity to rise this afternoon to put a question to me about leadership. I believe he should go back and do his homework, pick a leader and come back and try to put straight to the Canadian people what his Party would be able to do, before he puts a question to us with respect to our leader. I find it not only passing strange but a sad moment in Canadian history, that that Party, which is the Official Opposition of the Parliament of Canada in this House of Commons, has had in recent years three major policy conventions, and not one Canadian is able to identify what policies within the Party or what it stands for.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear that the Hon. Member opposite has not given any concern to the matter of leadership of his own Party. His Government has had some three years to demonstrate some ability to solve problems rather than to create them. I would like to ask the Hon. Member from New Brunswick if he is happy with the fact, if it should come to pass, of his leader leading his Party into the next election, whenever it might be?

Mr. Harquail: That is something, Mr. Speaker, with which we are not faced at the moment. The Official Opposition seems to hold down a pretty good corner on posing hypothetical questions. There is no doubt in my mind that we will be ready for an election at any time it may be called by the Prime Minister, as it is his sole prerogative to do. That is the system. That is the time-honoured historical, respected position, there for us all to live by, and I accept it. I must say, however, Mr. Speaker, with respect to unity in Canada, there is one thing on which we are united. On that night in Winnipeg when their leader was removed from office in such a despicable way it was sad to watch, and it is sad to bring to mind this afternoon that a group of men and women doing such a thing in public. Yet now, a few short days since that activity, one member of that party poses questions as to what we on this side think of what another person might do. Let me tell him one thing in concluding my answer to the question. As we have been able to demonstrate in the past, when we are faced with a decision we