

Summer Recess

have directly or indirectly helped bring about the wanted results of the Quebec referendum either by way of their personal and direct involvement in the field or by way of their attitude here in the House or by way of the very nature of their contributions in this place or by way of the things they did or refrained from doing. I take this opportunity to stress the merit which the parliamentarians of this House deserve for having contributed to our victory in the Quebec referendum.

We had the twofold responsibility of putting our country's affairs in order, at least with regard to the backlog of procedures and legislations. We had the twofold responsibility governing the country on the one hand and on the other being involved in a crucial campaign in order to secure Canada's unity and this country's survival. I think that on both sides of the House we have all taken our responsibilities to heart, and we did make the necessary effort which was met with the success we all know and which is a credit to all parliamentarians. But I would be remiss if I did not emphasize the tremendous work done by the very great majority of the hon. members for the province of Quebec in that respect.

Then, when we consider the volume of business I just summarized, this first part of the session may not appear to be sensational for certain people. They would say that Parliament did some business but it was dull. For sure, there has been nothing outstanding, there has been no scandal nor perhaps the kind of debates we have seen when the Canadian flag was adopted. However, there is a fact we all must admit, and it is that during its first two months of existence this Parliament has been very efficient. This government has behaved responsibly. This has to be said of Parliament also, not just of the government. And when I say that Parliament has behaved responsibly, this implies that members on both sides of the House who of course do not always agree with what we are doing, who have criticized some of our bills but have never abused their right to criticize, considering that the country had been through two elections and that it was urgent to dispose of some business to which I referred earlier.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my special thanks not only to members of this House but also to the senators, Madam Speaker, her assistants, the officers at the table and all the officials of the House of Commons as well as the pages who have all been very efficient and quite devoted and who at this time of the year, either on account of their children, their parents, their families, their spouses feel the need to withdraw and lead a normal life, whether they be members, employees of the House of Commons, members of the Press Gallery, the media or the public, most of whom are already on holidays or are going to be soon.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all those people who helped make Parliament during this first stage of the first session so productive and responsible and I am sure that all my colleagues on this side of the House will join me in extending to

all those who deserve them and whom I have just mentioned my very special thanks.

Finally, I wish to deal with one question but I see that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is absent—no, he is here. I am addressing my remarks especially to his party through him who knows the parliamentary spirit which induced us to co-operate as parliamentary leaders during this session and this comment, of course, is also aimed at the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton.

He knows the extent to which there has never been any desire on this side of the House, neither, I believe, on the Conservative side, but my colleague will speak on their behalf, will be tricky. Admittedly, it would be hard to fool the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre where procedure is concerned, in view of his long experience and wide knowledge of the rules. However, we have always refrained from attempting to take advantage of hon. members by resorting to procedural games, and as House leader it has always been my policy to use an open and straightforward approach, which up till now has been producing results. I would like to tell him this afternoon with the same open and straightforward frame of mind, that I am fully aware, after hearing the statements made up to this point by his leader, for whom I have much respect, by himself or by other hon. members, that he is looking for a way to tell the public at large, for reasons known to his party, his opposition to a government policy very well known to him.

The adjournment motion is a means by which his fellow members can make their points. One of many means, because up to this point, this week at least, during the question period, on the eighth day of the throne speech debate yesterday, following the statement made by the minister yesterday evening until 11.30 p.m., when every contribution had been made and nobody asked to be recognized, and today again, at least until four o'clock and later if his party so desires, he can have all the time required to fully express his views.

Mr. Broadbent: Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday!

Mr. Pinard: So what I would like to tell the hon. member and his colleagues, and the hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent), is that there is no rule we could apply to prevent the New Democratic Party from requiring the hon. members on both sides of the House, the staff employees of the House and all those who are interested in our debates, either the media or the public, to come back next Monday, if such is the wish of the New Democratic Party. Clearly then, there is no authority whatsoever in our rules under which I, as House leader, or any member here could force the hon. members to adjourn today. In other words, if NDP members want to return next Monday at all costs, nobody can prevent them. That is quite clear and I am aware of it. However, there are rules which allow members to sit beyond the regular sitting