

The Constitution

FEDERAL LIBERALS:
STOP MR. TRUDEAU
HAS MR. TRUDEAU OUTLIVED HIS
USEFULNESS?
YOU MUST KNOW THE MAJORITY OF
CANADIANS—

1. Don't want his changes put in the BNA Act before it is brought back to Canada. (64 per cent against it in Gallup Poll).
2. Don't want his French-English bilingualism made official coast to coast.
3. Don't want his cutbacks in oil production.
4. Don't want his increase of more and more nationalization of industry which does away with competition.
5. Don't want to keep picking fights with the U.S.A.—our best customer and military protector.
6. Don't want Ottawa trying to bully the provinces.
7. Don't want government to encourage Canadians to live beyond their means.
8. Don't want to pay for fully indexed pensions for the civil servants and MPs.
9. Don't want to leave our children an immense national debt.

After all, he got elected, not on any of the above issues, but on the issue of cheap gas which has proven to be a deception.

If you are unhappy with the federal government, let your Liberal MP know. Armed with letters—even a backbencher will be noticed by the party.

YOUR LIBERAL MP HAS MORE POWER THAN YOU MIGHT REALIZE.

I had not realized that. It continues:

The Liberals have 145 seats, and the combined opposition have 133, therefore the abstention of 12 Liberals could force an election or a change in leadership.

That is not the case now. Since they got in bed with our friends on my left it is going to take about 20 hon. members opposite to see through the hoax and vote against this crazy package, but that is all. On the back of this advertisement under the heading "Somebody's lying about oil!" it continues as follows:

Ottawa says western provinces get 43 per cent of the oil revenue. Western provinces say it's only 28 per cent.

Who's telling the truth? British Columbia energy minister Mr. R. H. McClelland (Dec. 9/80 *Globe and Mail*) has asked Ottawa three times to produce the formula for Ottawa's calculation of 43 per cent. He has received no answer.

If the federal government and the Western provinces cannot agree on the basic figures for our National Energy Program, why is it being rammed through Parliament before they understand each other?

Is this a good deal? Why are we paying Mexicans the world price for oil, more than \$40 a barrel while we pay our own Canadian producers less than half, \$17.75 a barrel?

The National Citizens' Coalition contends that the federal government is intentionally depressing the value of oil companies operating in Canada so that it will be able to buy the companies at bargain prices—then to be run by the civil servants, like the Post Office.

I ask hon. members if they remember the right hon. gentleman who campaigned against wage and price controls and then imposed them a few months later? That is the man who wants to re-do our Constitution. Do they remember the right hon. gentleman who proclaimed the War Measures Act, suspended the basic legal rights of all Canadians, suspended habeas corpus and incarcerated several hundred Quebecers for long periods without charges being laid, when a few people with \$10 and a "Saturday night special" were huddled in a cellar somewhere?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. The hon. member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) has the floor.

Mr. Stewart: Remember the right hon. gentleman who allowed the first secret trial in Canada when even the charges were laid secretly? I presented a motion under Standing Order 43 requesting an apology to my old friend Peter Worthington, *The Toronto Sun* editor who was also charged. That appeal for an apology was to no avail.

Remember the right hon. gentleman who promised cheaper oil and gas at the pumps and now has given us the highest gas prices in history, higher prices than were ever contemplated in the Crosbie budget? Remember the right hon. gentleman who has always said that he would prefer a republic to a monarchy and now is trying to give us one? Remember this right hon. gentleman—

Mr. Evans: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order under Standing Order 35. I think it is quite clear that this speech has been one flagrant violation of Standing Order 35 after another. According to Beauchesne's it is quite clear that the imputation of motives to members as being other than honourable is contrary to the rules. On page 115 Citation 326.(2) reads as follows:

Words may not be used hypothetically or conditionally, if they are plainly intended to convey a direct imputation.

I would suggest that also includes the reading of material, quote or unquote, that has the effect and intention of imputing motives that are simply and factually not true.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This is a question that has been raised before in the course of the debate. The Chair has attempted to bear in mind remarks that have come from both sides of the House and on occasion has asked the hon. member concerned to rephrase his remarks in such a way as to stay within parliamentary usage. I am sure it is the intention of the hon. member not to violate the rules of this House, and I invite him to take note of the comment that has been made.

Mr. Taylor: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) on a point of order.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. The actions of the Liberals have imputed more motions, more notions, disgraceful and sarcastic—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Bow River is not raising a point of order, as he knows.

Mr. Taylor: It is as good a point of order as theirs was.