

Income Tax Act

I had some trouble with advertising in 1972. A couple of constituencies engaged in advertising which was considered doubtful. One was around the Lakehead.

During that campaign I was also in Alberta. Correspondence called to my attention an advertisement being run on behalf of the then hon. member for Crowfoot. I got in touch with the hon. member's campaign manager who stated quite simply they had not considered anything offensive in that ad. I asked that it not be run again, and it was not. I do not make anything particularly of it. I simply indicate there have been instances in which advertising has been run by candidates, or associations on their behalf, which was at least of doubtful tendency in terms of its significance. It has not been limited to the Conservative party.

● (1622)

The reason I am taking part in this debate today is the reference made by the Minister of Transport to the practice and tactics of my party. I am rather proud of my party. I do not want to be too thin-skinned but I like to think that while I did not become prime minister I did at least not pursue or permit tactics which divided the country. There may have been some things in my party which could be criticized. There are a good many things I see in the Liberal party which I have criticized—and I could go back over them today beyond those I have mentioned.

There can be no question that it is a challenge in this country to achieve understanding between the various regions and an even greater challenge to achieve understanding between the French and English speaking people. My party under its present leadership is dedicated to improving and increasing that understanding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I like to think at least that I worked in that direction myself and I deeply resent, both personally and on behalf of my party, the intolerant, unrestrained and savage attack by the Minister of Transport. I think it was unworthy of a minister and his words could do nothing to improve understanding and a feeling of unity in our country. I deeply regret that they were uttered. Perhaps he, also, deeply regrets having said those things last night, but being a stubborn man he was not prepared to back off today.

Mr. Speaker, no one party in this country has a monopoly on good motives. No one party has a monopoly on patriotism. I myself distrust people who talk too much about patriotism. I think there is a lot to be said for the remark of old Dr. Johnson, who said that patriotism was the last refuge of a scoundrel. I suggested jokingly to the Minister of Finance in a private conversation last evening that he should bear those words in mind himself.

To conclude, I do not expect the Minister of Transport to withdraw any more or to express any regret. But as a former leader of the party I repudiate the attack made on my party and indirectly on myself personally. I repudiate it and I say to all members of the House that, if we are going to work to keep

[Mr. Stanfield.]

this country together, let us stop attacking the motives of those who are opposed to us and let us really seek to improve understanding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few brief comments. Many Canadians, through cable television, are now in the fortunate or unfortunate position, depending upon one's point of view, of being able to watch the proceedings of this House on a regular basis. I do not know what message other members have received but the message I have had is that, by and large, they view us as being long winded, repetitious, frequently fuzzy-minded and sometimes downright boring.

One of my friends was quoting Woodrow Wilson to me the other day in this regard. When Wilson was asked how long it would take him to prepare a speech, he said: "If you want me to talk for two hours, I will start right now. If you want me to talk for 40 minutes it will take me about a week. If you want me to speak for ten minutes it will take me about two weeks". My friend went on to recommend that most of us should be using the ten-minute version in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Buchanan: I will endeavour to comply. First, I should like to praise my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien). We have heard a great deal of criticism directed at the initiative he has taken. I suggest it was a vital and important initiative as far as this country is concerned. For the first time in Canadian history he went out to talk to his provincial counterparts before bringing in his budget to see whether there were any provincial initiatives which could be taken to the advantage of the country as a whole. Such an innovation, viewed against the background of the difficult times which Canada, along with much of the world, is passing, was, it seems to me, crucial to the well-being of the country.

I trust the response my colleague has received will not dissuade him from taking similar initiatives in the future. He would certainly be the first to admit that the result has not been a smooth operation or that there has not been a certain roughness around the edges. Nevertheless he has made a significant and important effort.

It was only after the acceptance of the budget by eight provinces that Quebec said no and produced a scheme designed mainly to benefit that province regardless of its impact on the rest of the country. It was a scheme designed to be divisive and to tear apart the Canadian market rather than unify it. The immediate reaction of the Tory party was: Whatever Levesque and Parizeau approve, we support.

Mr. Stanfield: There you go again!

Mr. Buchanan: I am sorry the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) takes umbrage at that remark. I think it is important that the reality be stated unequivocally. The stand