

As I indicated yesterday, and I will not take a great deal of time, the false information arose in a number of specific ways. The first is on page 1 of this document where it says, and I am reading from the English version:

An amending procedure will ensure that all changes to the constitution can be made in Canada.

That is false, Madam Speaker, and it falsely represents the position being put forward by members of the House of Commons who are members of the cabinet, the Government of Canada. What they are proposing is not a proposal that would have all changes made in Canada. They are proposing a procedure which would allow that those changes which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his government personally want relating to a charter of rights will not be made in this Parliament or this country. Those changes will be made in the Parliament of Westminster and in the country of Great Britain. The statement being put out is a false representation of the views of those members of Parliament who are members of the government.

This document goes on to say:

If the proposed resolution is endorsed by Parliament, the Government of Canada will submit the joint address to the Queen—

That again is a false representation of the position held by the ministers who are members of the House of Commons. They do not propose to have an address to the Queen based upon the endorsement of the resolution. They propose, instead, as any careful reading of the motion before the House would indicate, to have the joint address founded upon a procedural vote, a vote to concur in a committee report. It will not be a vote on the substance of the resolution because, indeed, we do not have a formal resolution before us. It will not be a vote which deals with the substance of the resolution. It will be a vote which deals with a procedural question as to how Parliament deals with a committee report. Therefore, Madam Speaker, this information which is the subject of advertisement by the Government of Canada again falsely represents the position of members of Parliament who are members of the Government of Canada.

I would argue that there is also a false representation in the statement in the preface to the other document which says:

—Canada will remain . . . a federal system of government—

That, in my judgment, is very much open to question at the moment because section 42 allows the Government of Canada, in effect, to end the federal system by ignoring the provinces as partners in the Canadian federation.

I agree that that may well be a matter for debate in the House, but certainly once you give one level of government the power to ignore the other level of the government absolutely, which is the unfettered power sought by the Government of Canada in section 42, you no longer have a federal system. Therefore that statement, if not false, is at least highly misleading.

I consider it also to be misleading that this document makes no reference to section 42. Indeed, it does its best to hide in the shadows this section which the government interprets in a way

different from the language of the resolution. Again, that is merely misleading.

The published statements I referred to are false. They falsely reflect the views of the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Fleming), the government House leader, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet), and other ministers of the Crown who are members of the House of Commons, because they do not describe with any accuracy at all the measure they have put before the House of Commons. Consequently they are false statements.

This is a matter which was not brought to your attention by my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East, by myself or others who took part in the earlier debate, because at that time we had not seen this document with those false statements. The argument we were making at that time had to do with television and, perhaps, some radio advertisements, and billboards, deliberately general in nature. This is much more specific and, as I point out to you, there are at least two instances where the views of members of the House of Commons are falsely reflected in a way I think constitutes a breach of the privileges of at least those members. If they are not prepared to raise this matter, then I, as Leader of the Opposition and an officer of the House of Commons, am prepared to act in their stead in drawing this to your attention.

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

**Madam Speaker:** I understand that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) is maintaining his question of privilege on the basis that certain documents contain false representations, and this is a new ground on which to invoke privilege.

**Mr. Clark:** That is right.

**Madam Speaker:** I see that several members are getting up to speak on this subject. I will hear from two members on one side and two members on the other side, and then I will decide in what direction I might be going on this particular matter.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order in respect of what you have just said. I do not know whether it is possible for you to gauge the course of an argument in advance in that you might hear all the points from two members. You may very well, but I say with respect that perhaps you should address your mind to the arguments, and if there are questions which are unanswered they may be answered by hearing more from one side or the other.

**Madam Speaker:** That is exactly what I said. I will hear from two on one side and from two on the other side, and I will then decide what course I will follow. I suppose the hon. member assumed that after that I would cut off the debate. That decision has not yet been reached.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Thank you.