

progress remains to be made, if this institution is to reflect the reality of our times, to respond to the demands of modern society, to take on its responsibilities and to govern a State as important and as vast as Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the third reason, after the first and the second—these were the backlog of legislation as a result of two elections in less than a year and the major reforms contained in the speech from the Throne in April 1980 and started and completed by this Government—the third reason, as I said, is the systematic obstruction by a Party that is in the Opposition and that constitutes the official Opposition, a Party that unfortunately has never been able to accept its defeat in the February 1980 election, a fact that, as I said before, has affected its conduct in the House, a Party that, unfortunately, has a shortage of ideas and has no specific, concrete policies to offer the Canadian public, contrary to those proposed by the Government.

I do not think I have to dwell on this aspect of my speech, since Hon. Members may wish to refer to a statement made by the former Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party when before Christmas, in Quebec, and this was quoted in a number of newspapers, he gave a very straightforward answer to a very straightforward question. He was asked: Considering the present recession, what would you do, as Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and if you were in power, to remedy the situation? What would you do that would be different from what the Liberal Government is doing now? The then leader of the Progressive Conservative Party answered as follows: We would not do anything different. We have no miracle solution. We would not do anything different from what the present Government is doing.

That is one of the reasons why the Official Opposition has no alternative solutions, is not proposing policies and has no ideas. This is not new. It was the same during the debate on the Constitution and on energy legislation. I also recall that during the debate on the Constitution in the House, the Official Opposition was very active, and by active I mean it engaged in dilatory tactics and actions aimed at insulting the Chair and at quite simply delaying the passage of Government proposals. The changes that were made to the Constitution were not proposed by the Progressive Conservative Party. Those amendments were the result of negotiations with the Provincial Premiers and of a ruling made by the Supreme Court of Canada. The only thing Members opposite can say in reply to that argument is: yes, but it was thanks to us if you had discussions with the Premiers, and we kept the House at a standstill for a while to give the Supreme Court an opportunity to render its decision. Well, that is precisely the point I am making: the arguments of the Opposition were strictly technical and it was only by accident that the Progressive Conservatives did contribute quite involuntarily to improve the resolution we had introduced for debate. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker, a fact which proves that the Progressive Conservative Party is

Supply

a party without new ideas, a party without any policy. The people of Canada know that, and it explains why they chose to filibuster our constructive proposals—they have no alternatives to bring forward.

In the energy policy debate, Mr. Speaker, we introduced a hefty Bill, I agree, but instead of coming up with solutions of their own—

An Hon. Member: It was the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm)—

Mr. Pinard:—no, that proposal did not come from the Hon. Member for Peterborough, it came from the Government. They asked that the Bill be split. We agreed to that, saying that we would sit down, debate the Bill and negotiate, but instead of proposing measures likely to improve our national energy policy, the Opposition was content with hijacking Parliament, assaulting the House and preventing its elected representatives from expressing their views. What a stupid way of voicing objections! In my opinion, an intelligent opposition means speaking, arguing, debating, advocating new ideas. But no, short of ideas the Opposition chose to keep the bells ringing for 16 days. It may be a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, but 16 days is the time it takes to have two throne speech debates. Unfortunately, Members opposite decided to ring the bells, bring Parliament to a standstill, prevent Members from speaking, and particularly free the Official Opposition from its responsibility to make constructive suggestions to improve the energy policy.

That is the second example of the kind of filibuster which the Official Opposition has resorted to so far in this session. This is why I said earlier that I had to smile at the motion by my colleague opposite alleging that we have no regard for the parliamentary institution. How ridiculous! I have just given two major examples of the Official Opposition's action to sabotage systematically the work of the Canadian Parliament and in spite of it, of the government's ability and responsibility in implementing the major reforms it had promised in its throne speech of April 1980, with due regards for Parliament and after intelligent debates.

In addition to what I have already mentioned and all we have accomplished during this historical and important session following the very substantial throne speech of 1980, with the cooperation of all Members of Parliament, admittedly including those on the other side, we have been able to try something new to improve our parliamentary procedure. This experiment is going well and I believe that it is a positive step and something which had to be mentioned during this debate because, in spite of the tense atmosphere in this House, of the controversial nature of the issues being debated, and of the conflicting attitudes and outlooks of the various parties, we have achieved a consensus and agreed to put to the test a long awaited reform which would be very beneficial to this institution. I believe that there is not a single Member who does not want Parliament to