

worthy of living another day." Big deal! Well, I say balderdash to such despotic arrogance by the man who would alienate the demographically fastest growing half of this country for one last power fling.

A few days ago my colleague for Halton (Mr. Jelinek) caused an uproar in the House by referring to the Prime Minister in prose which Mr. Deputy Speaker termed "an unparliamentary expression". Apparently, it is unparliamentary to use the four letter word which begins with "l", ends with "r" and has "i" and "a" sandwiched in between. Far be it from me, as one of the new boys in this House, to question the wisdom of my elders and those who have gone before me in Parliament.

In our deliberations, I assume we are guided by Beauchesne's rules and forms and the sections which deal with offensive language and personal attacks by one member upon another. Beauchesne delicately refers to this as any "irregularity in the warmth of debate". Is it unparliamentary to say that the right hon. gentleman's words and actions are at variance with the truth? Is it unparliamentary to say that the House and the people of Canada have been misled? Or, could one get around the rules of the House by couching the barb in semantics; by speaking with less than candor, with tongue in cheek?

In another era in Parliament a former member for New Brunswick once said that a Liberal member of the treasury benches has as much regard for the truth as a tom cat had for a marriage licence. I am not a member of any Canadian Bar Association, but it seems to me that the only defence against libel or slander is the truth. I read some rather damning and direct statements written by one Geoffrey Stevens in February issues of *The Globe and Mail*. Yet, I see no movement to summon Mr. Stevens before the bar of this House to answer his accusations, and Mr. Stevens used the most unparliamentary prose. He wrote on February 2 that "clarity and truth are incidental byproducts". In another column he made reference to "Liberal lies, deceptions and evasions." In yet another column he wrote:

—the perception that Mr. Trudeau has sinister, ulterior motives is widely held. That's understandable, given the way he has lied, bullied the provinces and tried to browbeat the British.

Mr. Stevens stopped short of asking his readers if they would buy a used car from the Prime Minister. He wrote that:

Today, Canada is marked by a lack of trust among regions, between regions and the centre, between the people and their elected leaders.

Mr. Stevens concluded his column by saying:

By a single act of statesmanship—drawing his charter and giving Canadians an opportunity to approve it—Mr. Trudeau would demonstrate that he is not trying to pull a fast one, that he believes his constitution is worthy of public support, that he trusts the people, that they can trust him.

What trust can there be when *The Globe and Mail* contends that:

Mr. Trudeau misrepresented his constitutional plans to the government of Britain and that he and his ministers have been misleading the Canadian Parliament and public about Britain's position.

I wonder how some of the Liberal backbenchers are able to look themselves in the face while they are shaving in the

morning. How can they remain mute and obedient trained seals in the face of the true facts, in the face of the truth?

● (2110)

The truth is that the Prime Minister's polls show that some 64 per cent of all Canadians in every province of Canada are opposed to unilateral action and amendment of the Constitution in Great Britain. The truth is that six of our ten provinces are attacking the federal position in the courts, that eight provinces are against it and I hope that after March 19 my own province makes it nine. At any rate, I ask the Prime Minister if eight troopers are marching down the street and one is out of step, who is at fault?

The truth is that a committee of the British House of Commons has stated it would be improper for Britain to amend the Constitution without the broad approval of the provinces. The truth is that the Prime Minister has been less than forthcoming about what he and his ministers told the British Prime Minister would be in the constitutional package and about what guarantees she gave concerning its passage through the British Parliament. That is very simple.

Why, then, are the trained seals on the government side of this House afraid to tell this Emperor Nero that he is fiddling while Canada burns? Why are they unwilling to do what is right instead of what his right hon. highness wants? Is there no one over there who will bell the cat? Why is that? Is a cabinet post or the job of parliamentary secretary worth the sellout of conscience?

I did not come to this House for personal position or gain. I now want to warn Canadian in general and members of the opposition in particular again against the three Ts—the trauma of the Trudeau treatise, this insidious plot to change our great Canada into a watered down republic.

Does fear of the Liberal Party prevent backbenchers from speaking their minds on this issue? Are backbenchers afraid of the living death that has befallen some of their colleagues like Turner, Basford and others who dared to speak out in opposition and in defiance of their leader and the Prime Minister? Are they afraid of limbo, of Coventry, of purgatory? Will no one on the Liberal side stand up against the Prime Minister and tell him he is wrong—dead wrong? Will no one tell him that he has gone too far? Is there no one who will oppose him in our steady march toward a presidential system of government? We must suffer power at any price because of one man's vanity. Let each government member ask himself or herself if he or she would buy a used car from that man. If Shakespeare were over on this side he would look across the aisle, aghast, and I am sure he would intone, "You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things."

An advertisement in *The Globe and Mail* of January 23 inserted by the National Citizens' Coalition—

Some hon. Members: "Quote".

Mr. Stewart: Yes, quote as follows: