

I want to quote from the now Lieutenant-Governor of Newfoundland and Labrador, representing the Crown and a province that the member for Mississauga South did not want to waste public money out of the public purse to visit so that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador could give their submissions before that committee.

In any event he is the Hon. James McGrath, known to yourself Mr. Speaker and me, formerly the hon. member for St. John's East, and the person responsible for some of our most recent procedural reforms. During the debate on the propriety of constitutional ads placed by the government in 1980, and by the way after debate had taken place in the House of Commons, Mr. McGrath stated his views on such government advertising on page 3528 of *Hansard* dated October 9, 1980:

The purpose of such advertising can only be to inhibit the Opposition in its attempt to debate government policy or the assumptions on which it is based.

Of course the current situation is far worse than anything Mr. McGrath could have been contemplating, because we are not yet even debating a bill in the House of Commons but the government is calling it a *fait accompli*. The now Lieutenant-Governor must have seen what was coming when he referred to, and I quote him again, on page 3528:

—the modern equivalent of the corruption and intimidation which contaminated the House of Commons at an earlier stage of its development.

Mr. McGrath has been gone from the House for a few years. Perhaps I should cite a more recent departure, a former Conservative Minister of Justice, the Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn, who has been gone for only 10 months. He is still actively practising law in this city. I would like to quote Mr. Hnatyshyn. He said at page 3529 of *Hansard*, October 9, 1980, during the same debate, and I quote him:

A multi-million dollar advertising campaign—is contrary to every fundamental principle upon which Parliament has been developed and fought for over the years.

I can only say to him, through you Mr. Speaker: "Well said, Ray".

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: We are going to miss him.

Privilege

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Now out of respect for the Prime Minister, although heaven knows why, I will restrain from quoting the former member for Yukon, the Hon. Erik Nielsen.

Some Hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): I would be willing if Your Honour and the Clerk wish that I deposit those citations with you, but I do not want to trespass on the goodwill of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. gentleman has referred to a recent book and the Chair of course would be interested in knowing which quotes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, Erik Nielsen has enough ammunition that he could run a loose-leaf service. I am not citing his book, which I do not expect you to read in the course of your duties. I am just saying that I do have citations from *Hansard* attributed to the former hon. member for Yukon, but I will not, as I say, trespass on the goodwill of the House here.

Let us just talk about some contemporary members of the House, some ministers who have been in the House for some time. Let us hear what they had to say during the same debate about those constitutional ads. The current Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources must have had his own Prime Minister and his own colleague, the Minister of Finance, in mind when he said on the same day, October 9, 1980, at page 3531 of *Hansard*:

What the government is attempting to do is—make the point—to everyone outside the House that no matter what argument is raised, legitimately or otherwise, that argument is not valid and that the plan of action has been completed.

Another minister who believes in taking the high road must have been in High River the day the cabinet authorized these ads, for the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs had this to say in the same debate, at page 3534:

I think that an attempt to spend public money, to manipulate public opinion on public questions that have not yet been decided is an improper practice that offends the rights of the House of Commons.

In the same debate, the Secretary of State, at page 3532 of *Hansard*, had this to say:

What the Government is trying to do is suggest that its advertisements reflect a decision that has been taken. That is false;