

Were they used to subsidize imports? No, they went into the general treasury. The consumers were already paying an excise tax and, indirectly, an export tax. On top of that, the petroleum compensation charge was collected in sufficient amounts to totally subsidize all imports.

In its very sneaky, dishonest, immoral manner the government put into general revenues taxes which were supposedly collected to maintain the one-point system. One can say so what, the government needs money. What bothers me more than the money is the downright dishonesty of the minister. I will give an example of what I mean. On March 23, 1982, in the Public Accounts Committee we heard testimony from the assistant deputy minister of energy, mines and resources, Mr. A. D. Hunt. These are his exact words:

The petroleum compensation charge revenues are used to compensate domestic classes of petroleum—

That is, Syncrude.

—as well as to pay compensation for imported oil.

Mr. Hunt, the assistant deputy minister, said that imported oil is fully compensated by the petroleum compensation charge. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources appeared on "Canada AM" on April 2, 1982, at 7.50 a.m. I suppose he thought no one would be listening who would catch him at his less than truth. He was asked by Miss Pamela Wallen:

The taxpayers in this country pay more than \$6 million a day to subsidize oil imports yet now, to solve a problem, we have to increase our exports?

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources replied:

Now whatever we export is charged, there is a tax export charge and the revenues coming from that export charge help in reducing our cost for the imported oil.

That is an absolute falsehood. What the minister said over public television when Miss Wallen asked him an embarrassing question is absolutely untrue. Truth to this minister is whatever facts he happens to believe suit his political purposes. That is the truth as far as he is concerned.

The net result of all of his chicanery, all of these taxes and all of these broken promises, is that right now in Canada we pay over \$2 a gallon for gasoline, \$1.35 of which is taxes. Sixty-seven per cent of what we pay at the pump is taxes.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has used unparliamentary language. I did not call it to your attention before because I wanted to be sure by reading Beauchesne and Erskine May. We are used to the hon. gentleman's diatribes and language that stretches propriety, as well as his allegations that are usually unfounded, misleading and, in my view, not worthy of this House. However, on three occasions in his speech he used the word "dishonest" applicable to members of this government, either present or past.

The use of that term is completely unparliamentary. I suggest that the hon. member not only abstain from using it, although he has used it on numerous occasions, but also withdraw his use of it in the recent past. In future he should

Energy Administration Act

refrain from using that term, in effect attempting to inflame public opinion in a very unparliamentary way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. The minister is saying that the word "dishonest" is unparliamentary when addressed to a member. I did not hear that. I did not hear him say a certain member was dishonest. If that was said, it is the privilege of the member to request that the word be withdrawn. I did not hear the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) call a particular member dishonest. The member can say that in his opinion the government acted in a dishonest way, but it is hard to ask that it be withdrawn if the words are not directed to a particular member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Blais: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I shall simply reserve the right to look at the blues and to inform the minister, because I understood the hon. member to use the term "dishonest". He used it two or three times in talking about the action taken by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). I do not want to waste the time of the House, but I simply want to remind the hon. member that he is a parliamentarian and that he should respect the rules of this House.

[*English*]

Mr. Andre: I will have to examine the blues. I certainly do not want to use any unparliamentary language, but the thoughts behind those words are factual. If the sensitive Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Blais) believes that the accusation is untrue, when he reads this I also ask him to read the statement made by the minister on "Canada AM" and I ask the minister to correct the wrongful information that he transmitted across the country. I ask him to be equally concerned about the truth as he is about the use of language in this House to try to describe the behaviour of the government of which he is part. He accuses me of inflaming. Unless there is some recognition soon by himself and by what the Prime Minister has called the "trained donkeys on the bankbenches of the Liberal Party"—and, by the way, that is a quote from his book, so hon. members opposite cannot accuse me of using unparliamentary language or being unkind; it is a quote from Pierre Elliott Trudeau's book—of what is happening and what hon. members opposite are doing by blindly—stupidly, I maintain—voting in favour of what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources keeps proposing to this House, they will leave carnage across the country.

• (1730)

It might be that the Minister of Supply and Services thinks I am being inflammatory, but 1,700 people were at a meeting of the Western Canada Concept in the Fraser Valley last night. Why were they there? They were there because of what I have just been talking about. They were there because of promises and deceptions, dishonesty and statements by the minister that they know to be untrue. This continuous propaganda barrage through multimillion dollar advertising campaigns—