[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

RESULTS OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, spearheaded by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), the new Progressive Conservative policy of economic revitalization is gathering strength as it rolls across the country, creating jobs and bringing prosperity in its wake. Since September 4, 112,000 new jobs have been created, and the number of unemployed has fallen by 50,000. Interest rates have fallen drastically as a result of the Conservative low interest rate policy. The bank rate has dropped 2 per cent in the last 6 weeks alone. The prime rate stands at 10.75 per cent, its lowest level since October, 1978. Mortgage rates are at a 13 month low, and construction cranes again dot the skyline.

Confidence and economic growth have returned to Canada under a PC Government. Our dollar is stabilizing, and inflation is under control. In fact, after a decade of Liberal-Socialist darkness, the light of opportunity again shines across our fair land. Sir, Canada welcomes the return of Conservative prosperity and economic well-being.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES—REFUSAL OF ENTRY TO EMINENT CANADIAN AUTHOR

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, a plot has been revealed. Americans and Canadians can now sleep safely in their beds knowing that Farley Mowat has finally been exposed.

What red-blooded Canadian did not feel there was some nefarious threat or hidden meaning behind books called *The Boat Who Wouldn't Float*, or *The Dog Who Wouldn't Be*? The man who wrote those books has been seen talking to unsuspecting school children. He has had courses named after him which is certainly reminiscent of Maoism and Marxism. He has been seen sneaking into Government House. He has been known to prowl our northern frontiers. But now, thanks to the superior work of the U.S. immigration officials, we are no longer fooled. The kilt is again recognized as a sign of subversion.

After reading *Never Cry Wolf*, we know that the Wolf Cub movement is certainly a subversive organization. Thousands of innocent young men are now identified as suspected terrorists. The son of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), the son of Marc Garneau, are now suspicious characters in Canada. Speaking of Marc Garneau, why would anyone go to space except to talk to Russians?

This House owes a vote of thanks to the officials of the U.S. Immigration Department and the rules they enforce. Without their efforts, Farley Mowat would walk around this country pretending to be a well respected Canadian artist.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

AWARDING OF CONTRACTS

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. Each day we learn that more and more facts are coming to light in the Wilson affair. The brother-in-law of the Minister of Finance received a contract worth $234,000, and it was untendered. Not only that, the vice-president of the same company had been employed in the office of the Minister for some weeks just before the contract was awarded. Yesterday we learned that the Minister's brother-in-law and former assistant received a second contract without bidding.

Also, yesterday this House was advised by the Minister of Employment and Immigration, in a conflict of interest case involving Mr. Greenbaum, the chairman of the immigration review committee, that there was nothing wrong in Mr. Greenbaum's action, but nevertheless:

> —any suggestion or hint or impropriety would undermine the confidence of that process, it would therefore be better if he were to submit his resignation.

Is the Prime Minister in agreement with the words and action of the Minister of Employment and Immigration? If so, why is he not applying the same criteria to the Minister of Finance?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): I am in full agreement with the attitudes as expressed by the Minister of Immigration. I am not applying them to the Minister of Finance because the situation is completely inapplicable. It is entirely different. There is a completely different set of circumstances and I think my hon. friend, who has both friends and relatives here and elsewhere, and who has served as a Minister of the Crown, is aware of that. He served as the Minister of Finance, and he would be the first to acknowledge that there is no comparison whatsoever between the situation which gave rise to the action taken by the Minister of Immigration and that of the Minister of Finance.

The case of the Minister of Finance, and I think we have been through it reasonably thoroughly, was handled quite properly according to objective criteria, by the Minister of Supply and Services, who rendered an objective judgment, in which decision public servants played the major role.

It happens that the integrity of the people involved was such, and I think it is important that my hon. friend acknowledge this, that they immediately wrote thereafter to the Government saying that "this kind of business is not good for the Canadian taxpayer and we suggest that you cancel it". This is