

Supply

managed to earn no less than \$205,257.00. I am not questioning the integrity of those lawyers, whether they were Liberals or Tories. As far as I am concerned they were qualified Canadians, and I mean that sincerely. Nor am I questioning the judgment of the then Minister of Transport. All I am asking is that the same sense of integrity and judgment be applied to this side of the House.

Mr. Trudeau: Hypocrites!

Mr. Mackasey: There were dozens and dozens of similar experiences in the short time the Tories were in charge, that I could dig out every day I wanted to then dig out, all of which were perfectly proper, all of which reflected the fact that the Government in power was doing its job, all of which, if brought into the House with the tactics used by the Opposition, could smear the reputation of each and every one of those Ministers and each and every one of those recipients.

That is one of the problems and worries that plague ex-Ministers—and I have been “ex” more often than most people in this House. I, too, have my sense of integrity, and I am not afraid to express it and utilize it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is all ears.

Mr. Mackasey: Oh, the Hon. Member is interrupting me. I have seen a slight change in his standards in recent weeks and I want to talk about that.

There is something about this House which I respect—I will go as far as to say I love it. It brought me back, and I keep coming back here.

An Hon. Member: Like a song.

Mr. Mackasey: You will never be back—oh, I am sorry, Steve. I meant your seatmate.

Unless we maintain a certain standard of morals in this House, all of us, including the Government, including Cabinet Ministers, including myself—this House will not continue to serve the country and the people of this democratic country, properly.

It behooves all of us to meet a level of morality which the Leader of the New Democratic Party attempted to spell out earlier today.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that people at home—and many are, those who are unemployed—watching this House day in and day out—frustrated with the unemployment insurance cheques running out, frustrated after looking for jobs all morning—I suppose their priorities are different from ours. They turn on the radio to listen to Question Period or the television to watch it, hoping that something will be said to give them some hope of recovery, some sense of what is going on and whether certain projects are about to take place.

What do they see, day in and day out? Grown men playing Perry Mason, attempting to discredit one of the best Ministers of Finance—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, it almost escapes reality at times, and I mean that. I do not get angry, because I have seen these changes in friend of mine. I am sure there are times when I lose my temper and say things that I regret. I was not too upset today when the Hon. Member for Yukon referred to the corruption of the Government, or to the appointment of the Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) as Chairman of Air Canada. Nor was I particularly upset when that bounced, although I could not quite understand the morality of the Conservatives, since in that same week they named Jean Wadds, the former Party President, to be High Commissioner in Great Britain. I could not understand what she had that I did not. Mind you, she was a Tory and I was a Liberal. But a Party with their moral standards would not take that into consideration.

When he mentioned that another symbol of our decadence was the appointment of Michael Pitfield to the Senate, I asked myself, who would make the best addition to the Senate—Michael Pitfield or Lowell Murray? I suspect, after the fiasco in Winnipeg, that if appointments still had to be made he would never make the Senate.

Is it not time we all took a long weekend, or just a weekend, and did a little soul searching about what has gone on in the House in the last few weeks?

Mr. Trudeau: Hypocrisy!

Mr. Mackasey: I do not pretend that this is a Sunday school. It never was and never will be, nor should it be. I believe in strong debate. I envy those people who speak easily, as I do not. I envy the great Parliamentarians, particularly those in Great Britain where debate has been a way of life and where the people have a sense of history, a sense of integrity and a love of democracy. They understand that the written word, but more particularly the spoken word, is sometimes the difference between the democratic process and dictatorship or some other less favourable system.

I have to say—and I wish the Hon. Member for Yukon were in the House—that his tactics were more suited to the sixties than to the eighties. I must confess that I listened to him this morning attempting to convert or amend his speeches that brought down people in the sixties, to today. I doubt if a single backbencher in the House will ever again fear the mighty Member for Yukon, who made an almost pathetic contribution; it was merely a pathetic contribution. It was almost like Mohammed Ali going into the ring once too often. There was nothing there. There was nothing there for one reason—there is no substance to the argument that the Minister of Finance acted immorally or without a sense of integrity or conferred special treatment on one Alastair Gillespie. No amount of articulateness on the part of the Hon. Member for Yukon could create something that was not there.