

Excise Tax Act

worry about disappointing the people of my riding. I have told them the truth and I will continue to tell them the truth. In four years, we will be over there and government Members will be over here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Other questions or comments?

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the Hon. Member has not answered the question. How will he vote on the Bill, for or against?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I hate to have to repeat everything I have already said. Let me try to make myself clear. We are debating this Bill and studying every clause in it. Now we are studying its general principle. Later we will discuss every clause. When the time comes for final reading, our Party critic will clearly announce to the House the position we will take.

Right now I am expressing in great detail my reservations on two different clauses of the Bill. I dealt with the Government not living up to the commitments it made during the past election. If the Hon. Member and others wish me to go through the whole series of thoughts that I expressed previously, I am quite willing to do so. I would be surprised if that were the case. I am personally willing to listen to what other Hon. Members have to say about this. However, if that is not the case, I will continue to conclude my remarks in response to statements or questions for the remaining 10 minutes afforded me.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chartrand: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make a few comments about the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria). First, I want to tell him that he really knows how to represent his constituency and that the whole House is now aware of the name of Glengarry-Prescott-Russell. I have never heard the name of a constituency repeated as many times as in his speeches.

He stated that we made 338 election promises. Perhaps we made many promises, but how can he say, after we have been in power for only three months, that we do not keep our promises and will not keep them? In my opinion this is a gratuitous statement.

He also said that we delayed proceedings last year by letting the bells ring and by not taking part in the debate. I do not understand how he can make such a statement since as neither he nor I were in this House last year. The Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell was not a Member of Parliament at the time, so how can he say that we delayed the business of the House? In this regard, if I try to think as others would, even though I was at home myself and had to follow what happened in the newspapers, I would be inclined to say that this was perhaps an attempt to make the former Government—and I do mean the former Government because it is no longer in power and will not be for many years—understand

that there were ways to make them listen to us, and I believe that this was one way to do it.

The Hon. Member says that he wants to serve his constituents, but so do we, all of us. We were elected to serve the people of our constituencies as well as we can. In my own riding of Verdun-Saint Paul, and I can at least mention the people of my region, I was told to take means available to represent my constituents well. I believe this is what the Hon. Member is doing. He is using his voice. He speaks well, but there are many other means available and what we did last year was perhaps a way, short of going on strike, at least to force the government to listen to us.

The Hon. Member also made another statement which I find very unfounded, namely when he said that we give the farmers \$1 with one hand and we take back \$2 with the other. I would like to know how he can be so specific about this amount and state without proof that we are taking back more from the farmers than we are giving them. I do not understand this.

Mr. Speaker, the statements made by the Hon. Member and his attitude towards us are quite unwarranted. To me, attacking the Government is not an acceptable way of representing his constituency. I am a Government member and do not consider myself a back-bencher. Freedom of speech is a right enjoyed by each and everyone of us but surely there are much more important things to say if we want the Government to work and to provide all Canadians with the necessary services and everything else available to help them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria). I must remind him that he has only a few seconds left.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. I wish to thank the Member for his comments. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that I have no excuse to make whatsoever for having expressed in this House the opinion of the constituents of Glengarry-Prescott-Russell. I have been duly elected for this purpose and that is what I have been doing from the start, so you better get used to hearing me out because I will be around for a long time yet, Mr. Speaker. All Members should keep that in mind.

Now, the member has alluded to the fact that this Government—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order! I do not want to contradict you so early in your speech after what you just said, but your time has expired.

[*English*]

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the chance to join in the debate. In the last few minutes, I have been listening to the debate and I have never heard a discussion that sounded more like a paternity suit.