

Privilege

that decision has not been taken. Those advertisements cannot be justified as being in any way a reflection of a decision taken here.

In 1980, the now Secretary of State for External Affairs flew into a rage in the House of Commons over one single ad proposing constitutional change which had been debated in the House of Commons, which he and his Party later voted for and which became the Constitution Act, 1982. He was furious at that one single ad which portrayed Canada geese floating across a Canadian sky. To him, that was a most dangerous type of ad.

• (1130)

I want to say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister, that what was sauce for the goose in 1980 is sauce for the gander in 1989.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I want to go to the ultimate authority here. I want to quote the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): For once in his political career, he was not throwing around red herrings.

I challenge him to appear in his full academic regalia and repeat the words he spoke in the House of Commons on October 9, cited at page 3537 of *Hansard*. I am sure he has memorized what he said. He memorizes most of what he says.

He said:

My privilege, my reputation and my honour as a member of this House have been degraded because members of the government have been proclaiming around the country, in my name, and in the name of all members of this Parliament, slogans and view points that I believe not to be merely misleading but in many respects to be downright dishonest.

There are days I wish cabinet ministers would get up under the rules in Question Period and put a question or two, because then the Minister of National Health and Welfare could repeat his famous question of October 22, 1980, and pose it to the Minister of Finance. This is what the Member for Wellington—Dufferin—Simcoe, now the Minister of National Health and Welfare said then.

May I ask the Minister how he can justify this double standard of exempting the Government from provisions regarding false and misleading advertising, where false and misleading advertising by the private sector would result in criminal charges being laid by the Government?

If private citizens can be prosecuted for misleading advertising why not the government of Canada?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): I know that the Minister of National Health and Welfare was in on the decision to place these ads because we all know that he has to be part of every important decision. The only thing to change faster than the views of the Minister of National Health and Welfare was the decision to nuke his submarine plan. The only reason I have to feel sorry for the Minister of National Health and Welfare is that I understand he recently went to see the movie *Batman* and found that the role of Robin the Boy Wonder had been scrapped from the latest version of it.

What happened to all those criticisms, to all those objections that members of Parliament, now sitting on the government side of the House, now cabinet ministers of the Crown, must have raised to this advertising campaign about the goods and services tax proposal? Did they raise the same objections in Cabinet that they raised in the House, or were those objections lost in the panelling of the cabinet room? Did they simply fall on the deaf ears of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, a Prime Minister, after all, who doesn't really care too much about the fundamental principles of parliamentary practice and prefers a presidential stance.

Perhaps the Prime Minister himself dreamed up that phrase: "Please save this notice". The only reason people will save this notice is because they will want it as a reminder to vote against the Conservative government in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

I move from quoting certain honourable hypocrites to the serious ruling of a serious person. The then Speaker and now Her Excellency the Governor General, Madam Speaker Sauvé, outlined to the House how advertisements such as the one in question may be seen as a contempt of the House. She said that the advertisements would constitute contempt of the House if there was, and now I quote her, "some evidence that they represent a publication of false, perverted, partial or injurious