

reports of the proceedings of the House of Commons". That is found at page 3781 of *Hansard* of October 17, 1980.

I submit to Your Honour that the present case clearly meets the criteria established by Madam Sauvé and clearly constitutes a contempt of this House. What could be more false, perverted, partial or injurious than to place advertisements in daily newspapers across the country implying and saying directly that certain tax changes would come into effect when such tax changes had never been considered in any proceedings of the House of Commons?

The advertisements are not partially false, they are totally fiction. If publication of any partial proceeding of the House constitutes contempt, then fabrication of tax changes which can only be made by proceedings of this House must also constitute contempt of this House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Madam Sauvé, when she was Speaker, continued as follows:

—when a person or a government attempts to interfere with our deliberations through spending public money, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, or acts in contempt of the House, such action would constitute a prima facie case.

That was on October 17, 1980, as reported on page 3781 of *Hansard*.

The advertisements in question today bear the following headline, I remind you:

On January 1, 1991, Canada's Federal Sales Tax System Will Change. Please Save This Notice.

These advertisements contain several paragraphs on the other side which precisely and concisely describe and explain the tax changes which are supposed to take place. These advertisements, Mr. Speaker, are a breach of the privileges of the House, not only because they present an erroneous, distorted view of our deliberations, but also because they state that the tax system will be changed and that it will be changed in a very specific way.

Under the Finance Department's imprimatur, which any right-thinking Canadian would take to be true, we find sentence after sentence containing flagrant untruths.

Privilege

How can one publish such notices announcing that certain changes will be made when no bill to that effect has yet been presented to the House of Commons?

[*English*]

Madam Speaker Sauvé said this in another related ruling found at page 4213 of October 29, 1980:

In the context of contempt, it seems to me that to amount to contempt, representations or statements about our proceedings or of the participation of Members should not only be erroneous or incorrect, but, rather, should be purposely untrue, improper and import a ring of deceit.

It is with great regret that I must state that the advertisements placed by the Department of Finance under the authority of the Minister of Finance do indeed import a ring of deceit. The advertisements were knowingly placed by the very people who were best placed to know that they were untrue, who knew they were misleading, who knew they smacked of nothing but deceit and who knew that there was nothing that Parliament had done in any way to validate the statements in the advertisements.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, the only possible serious purpose of the advertisements was to attempt to influence the Canadian public not to bother attending committee hearings, not to bother giving their views to members of Parliament, not to bother with the reports of the Finance Committee of the House of Commons, but to believe what was in those advertisements was the truth, even though it was not the truth.

• (1140)

It was an attempt to influence the Canadian people into believing that the ads represented an alleged fact, a parliamentary fact, even though they did not, and that the ads constituted the will of Parliament and expressed in the text a decision of the will of Parliament even though there had been no decision, no bill, no deliberations, no debate and probably not even a drafted text. That is only possible argument to be offered for placing those ads.

This is not only a breach of members' privileges, it is a contempt of Parliament. It is a fundamentally dishonest move to deceive the public by people who should know better.