

Supply

House so that we can do things to generate the economy and bring down unemployment, Members of both Parties opposite have placed priority on the question of whether Mr. Alastair Gillespie did or did not breach the spirit of the guidelines. For that matter, they think they see an opportunity to bring down the Minister of Finance.

I have had my differences with the Minister of Finance over the last 20 years. He is rather hard-headed, even if he smiles a lot, but he is a man of integrity. He has devoted the best years of his life to the service of his country. I understand why the Minister of Finance, despite the opportunity waiting for him out of here as a top notch legal expert in this country, wants to be here to defend his reputation, because his reputation is important to him. It is, as he says, probably the most precious asset any of us have in life. I have been worried and concerned in my 20 years about the immunity which each and every one of us in this House has. Every time this debate arises, whether it is brought to a head, as this one will be, or whether it is continued in Question Period, sooner or later you find reasonable Members, who individually are friends of mine, acting collectively, dropping their own standards, acting like a pack, braying at the nipped feet of the Minister of Finance, much like a pack of wolves trying to bring down a grizzly. For what purpose? What is there about this House that changes reasonable people into that kind of people without any moral standards of their own?

As the Leader of the New Democratic Party attempted to spell out this morning, the issue before the House is one of morality. He is absolutely right. It is a more important issue than legality, because the people of Canada judge the House of Commons by the collective morals of the Members of this House. That implies that not only must the Cabinet have morals and not only should the backbenchers of the Government have a moral code, but so should Members opposite practice what they preach.

My good friend, the Minister of Energy quoted an old English proverb. I suppose I could have suggested one to him which applies to Members opposite: "People in glass houses shouldn't throw stones".

This Government has been charged with corruption day in and day out in Question Period. There have been inferences of slander and innuendoes. What are we guilty of? The defender of the morals of the House of Commons for 20 years, the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), told us what those standards are today. This Government is corrupt because it pays Mr. Macdonald \$800 a day.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mackasey: It is corrupt because it appointed Mr. Pitfield to the Senate and the Member for Lincoln to Air Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mackasey: That's fine. Also because the Minister of Finance, in their opinion, is not a man of integrity.

Let us look at the record of the Tories in 1979. What was the going rate in 1979 for Tory lawyers hired by the Tory Minister of Transport? Was it \$100 a day? Was it \$150 a day?

Some Hon. Members: Higher.

Mr. Mackasey: Was it \$200 a day? I will read it.

An Hon. Member: Name them.

• (1710)

Mr. Mackasey: I do not get down to personalities.

In the famous Mississauga railway accident inquiry, set in motion on December 4, 1979 by Order in Council, legal counsel was hired by the then Minister of Transport. I want to say that I have great respect for him. I do not question his integrity. Nor do I question the fact that one of the firms he hired goes by the beautiful name of Tory, Tory, Deslauriers and Binnington of Royal Park Plaza, and then there were Keyser, Mason, Coleman, McTavish and Lewis. With good Scotsmen in there it means the job will be done. What was their fee? Was it \$50 or \$60 per day? No, it was \$100 per hour.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mackasey: And no allowance for inflation, Mr. Speaker. It was not limited to \$800 per day—it was limited to \$6,000 per week.

Mr. Chrétien: Expensive lawyers!

Mr. Mackasey: There was nobody on a per diem, and we do not have to worry about overhead. None of the \$800 has to go for office expenses—that is a separate issue. The cheques are not paid to the representative of Tory, Tory, Deslauriers and Binnington, they are paid directly to the company. Were any additional fees charged for expenses? Not too many. Oh, there were some fees paid to various legal assistants. An extra \$6,000 in the case of Tory, Tory; telephone, travel, office supplies, courier services, searches, photocopies, are all meticulously charged over and above.

Mr. Trudeau: Above?

Mr. Mackasey: Another \$14,363.92.

I am not going to embarrass the other firm which was not thought of with quite the same respect and perhaps was not of quite the same quality. It was not entitled to the same fee, and only got \$95 per hour.

Mr. Chrétien: A cheap firm.

Mr. Mackasey: All I know, Mr. Speaker, is that I am sure we got value for our dollar. That was a very important investigation and a very serious accident. I am not appalled by the fact that Tory, Tory, Deslauriers and Binnington were paid a total of \$167,074.97 for their services. It shows how important it is to get \$95 per hour rather than \$100, because they