

**Mr. Chrétien:** Not at all.

● (1612)

**Mr. Stanfield:** He says not at all. I think he should. I hope he is able to work it out eventually. However, he ought not to ask this House to vote on the question until he has it worked out.

I want to say something else on this point in connection with the bill. The Minister of Finance and other members on that side of the House, realizing that they are in a position of some difficulty, try to work out their difficulty by attacking the motives of myself and other members of the opposition. They take the view that you cannot disagree with or criticize the position of this government unless you are a separatist or have separatist tendencies.

Whenever the Minister of Finance is asked about the level of the dollar or some other aspect of the policy which he finds difficulty in answering, he criticizes the motives of those asking the question. I had hoped we had gotten beyond that in this country. I must protest the tone of that kind of response.

I resent very much hearing the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), for example, suggest that members of the opposition are speculating on the dollar. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner) accused members of the opposition of speculating on the dollar. There has been no withdrawal of either remark. The Minister of Finance and others are constantly accusing the members of the opposition of hurting the country, being only interested in securing some cheap political advantage, incidentally never giving any information and never answering the question.

I would not have risen simply to have made these points today, because I think they have been pretty well made already. However, the Minister of Transport took off last night and he took off again in the House this afternoon. He said it was the tactics of the Conservative party to divide the country. Last night he said, and I quote him:

Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the action of the Conservative party is that, whatever its public and apparent stand is here in this House, back on the hustings across this country they seize upon every... opportunity... to encourage feelings of hate and antipathy in this country.

As a former leader of the Conservative party for some seven years or so, I had some responsibility for the tactics of the Conservative party at that time. It was very clear from the minister's remarks that he was speaking about the tactics of the Conservative party for some period of time. He called upon the present leader to correct these tactics.

I recognize the need for all of us who are members of parliament, and indeed everybody who has any part to play in public life in this country, not only to exercise restraint in terms of people in other parts of the country and in terms of people who speak in tongue different from theirs, but to recognize the responsibility we all have to encourage restraint and increase understanding. I say to you in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, we do not need the kind of vicious, unrestrained

### *Income Tax Act*

remarks that the Minister of Transport made in the House last night and again this afternoon.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pinard:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order! The parliamentary secretary rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the right and privilege of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) to raise a question of privilege regarding the term just used by the previous speaker. Obviously, the word "vicious" is unparliamentary and I want to reserve the right of the Minister of Transport.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanfield:** I was making the point, before the parliamentary secretary saw the need to rise and make his point, that we all have a responsibility to exercise restraint and to try to increase understanding in this country. We all have a responsibility to refrain from inflammatory remarks which encourage distrust in our country. We do not need the kind of hot-headed, unrestrained, intolerant, unjustified and, indeed, vicious remark made by the Minister of Transport in the House and the drift of his remarks here this afternoon.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** I recognize that through the years there has been a tendency among candidates from time to time to get a little enthusiastic in their desire to get votes and succeed in getting elected and to yield to the temptation of attacking some other parts of the country. For many years the Liberal party made quite a thing about attacking Toronto, the people of Ontario and those in my own province of Nova Scotia. One can say that is fair game. I do not make too much about that. It is an old practice. It did not involve any racist element or anything of that sort.

I recognize as well that there are times when advertising during campaigns gets a little out of hand. I recall very well during the 1968 campaign—and I am sure this was not the wish of the Prime Minister—the Liberal party in western Canada running on the basis that the Prime Minister was the one to put Quebec in its place. Some Liberal candidates in Alberta, or at least their associations, ran ads accusing me, as leader of the Progressive Conservative party, of supporting special status for Quebec. Those ads had no purpose other than their obvious purpose, and that was to create doubt in the minds of the people in the west as to how firm I was on Quebec. They wanted to create the impression that I was soft on Quebec and that I would yield to Quebec things that ought not to be yielded to Quebec. I had to chase the Prime Minister through most of that campaign in 1968 to get him to repudiate that kind of approach and advertising.