

expressed by the elected representatives of Canadians, and that I think that is significant.

Let me go on with some of the other quotes from some other members of the New Democratic Party, because there are so many. In 1985, the hon. member for Oshawa again made comments about the Senate.

[Translation]

I believe it was during the March 5, 1985 Question Period, on page 2741. Mr. Broadbent asked the following question, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, given the views of the Minister of Justice—I am trying to be very temperate—on this institution, and the well known views of the Deputy Prime Minister and, I dare to say, hopefully half of the Cabinet, not to mention 80 per cent of the people of Canada who correctly see the Senate as being useless and costly simultaneously, and since it takes the same section of our Constitution to abolish the Senate as it does to provide any other amendment of substance, will the Prime Minister give us his assurance today that he will propose to the provinces the correct, democratic action, which is to abolish this abominable institution?

• (1750)

In light of such remarks concerning the Senate, Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated by the thought that the New Democratic Party would support a motion such as the one we are considering this afternoon. On January 23, 1981, as recorded on page 6533 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, said something else in a debate on the length of the senatorial mandate, and I quote:

—that there is no place in our parliamentary democracy for a body that is not elected, not responsible to anyone and that as the Senate now stands it should be abolished.

[English]

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Milliken:** The hon. member for Edmonton East applauds and yet his party has changed that position. I presume he was in the minority that opposed the change in the position at the convention. I do not know how that got away from the New Democratic Party at that time.

The other amazing thing is at the convention they changed their policy and yet the hon. member for Kamloops, who announced the change of policy in this House on May 10, has a motion on the Order Paper which was put there on April 4 of last year. It states:

### Supply

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of abolishing the Senate—

It is still sitting on the Order Paper waiting to be discussed. The hon. member for Kamloops now apparently supports his party's ridiculous position where they really do not know what they are doing. They are looking at the options, as it were. They got rid of their policy of abolition and they do not know what else to do.

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** What is the Liberal policy?

**Mr. Milliken:** Our policy has been for an elected Senate. The hon. member for Edmonton East wants to know the Liberal policy. It has always been perfectly clear. We have always had that policy.

I want to go on with other quotes. I could quote the hon. member for Churchill.

[Translation]

During a debate on the Senate in this House on March 12, 1985, the hon. member said on page 2958 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

The image of overpaid Liberal and Conservative fund raisers, campaign managers and defeated or retired candidates who “work”—and I put that word in quotation marks—three days a week and do very little of value, is not too far from the truth. Not too many people realize that in an average week the Senate only sits three days. An average day is usually not a full day.

On the next page of *Hansard*, he goes on to say:

—To then create another body to control the elected representatives of the people of Canada is completely and obviously undemocratic.

That is the opinion of the hon. member for Churchill. Where is he today? Did he participate in this debate? No, because he clearly disagrees with this motion.

[English]

He would clearly disagree with this motion. He would not have supported this based on his previous statements in 1985. The hon. member for—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Schneider):** On a point of order, the hon. member for Edmonton East.

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** I do truly hesitate to interrupt the flowing waters of the hon. member, however I feel that I really must object to his imputation of opinion to the hon. member for Churchill, especially when that imputation is that he would somehow disagree