

Energy Supplies

want to repeat it? It is this kind of thing which is causing people concern, and they are learning a great deal as a result of TV. They are finding it difficult to understand some of the frivolities. After all, we are always serious in the House of Commons or we would not last very long. A sense of humour one must have, but across this country today people are asking themselves: "What is the attitude of this government? They give us answers that are not true."

I have had questions on the order paper since November 12 and November 22, I believe, which have not been answered. They are perfectly simple questions. The only reason that they are not answered is that the government is afraid of what the answers will be and that they will as a consequence be embarrassed. Trust cannot be built in this House of Commons that way. Parliamentary underlings cannot be deciding what questions shall or shall not be asked.

I asked another question, I believe around February 15 or February 20, which will be of interest to hon. members from Quebec, about how Levesque got the Legion of Honour. It is just a question because I see a nice relationship between Levesque and his former pal, the Prime Minister. Why do we not get an answer? I asked the Speaker in a letter to do something, and he said that there was nothing he could do. Yet the other day in the House I found out in consequence of an admission that he had informed the CBC that only certain selective things can be placed before parliament.

Another example is the Treu case. Treu was treated like a reprobate. What about "Go-go-Goyer"? We paid out \$10,000 for that matter without any justification whatever. I am simply pointing out—and it is as disturbing to me as it is to all Canadians—that we have come to the point where we cannot believe anything which this government says. It either refuses to answer when it will be embarrassed, or the answers which it gives are given with a total disregard for the facts.

● (1240)

I simply ask of the minister that he establish for himself a record of an appreciation of parliament not by wave of the hand but by simply saying, "We do not need the power, we are not going to push it through and we will simply permit this subsection (4) in the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham to be accepted." If he does that he will do more for parliament than anything else he could possibly do. He could at least show that he has a respect and an appreciation for parliament and that he does not intend to ride rough-shod over an opposition that produces an amendment to a provision which he does not need. If he does not need it, why does he ask for it?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Appolloni: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the right hon. gentleman would allow a question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have no objection to questions, but we are trying to get questions answered by the government now. I hope she will be more successful in any that she asks.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The right hon. member did not accept the question.

An hon. Member: Yes, he did.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, I will.

Mrs. Appolloni: Mr. Speaker, a few seconds ago I was watching the electronic *Hansard* and I thought I heard a few references made by the right hon. gentleman to some deletions from the blues of *Hansard* of a motion he had purportedly made some time last week. I wonder if the right hon. gentleman would elucidate and tell us exactly which motion was eliminated from the blues of *Hansard*.

The right hon. gentleman has been around for a very long time and has been most welcome in this House, but what he is imputing and the impression he could give to the voters of Canada, as I know he will understand, is very, very serious. I wish he would elucidate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the question is a reasonable one and a responsible one. It had to do with a motion that was made in this House, moved by myself and seconded by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

The proper procedure in connection with motions under Standing Order 43 as I understand it is this: it does not require a seconder when it is made but once it is accepted by the Speaker then the motion takes place. I said that the Speaker, without giving me any opportunity at all, announced that it had been moved by me and seconded by the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson). I rose and said it was not seconded by him, that it was seconded by the hon. member for Vegreville. When that did not appear on *Hansard*, on the blues, I wrote underneath what had happened, clearly and definitely. The motion, I said, was moved by me and seconded by my hon. friend.

That is the point that I strongly object to, because if we get to a point where motions that are made here can be deleted because they do not meet the finer sensibilities of those who today are in office, then we have ruined parliament. I have to answer the question.

Mr. Pinard: Who are you accusing?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pinard: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like the right hon. gentleman to state clearly, if he has a little courage, who he is accusing.

Mr. Diefenbaker: As the hon. member grows older and more intelligent, he will realize the answer to that question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Disrespect.