

### Supply

The wonderful Liberals! The Liberals have short memories. I would like to read into the record a letter of April 28, 1980 from the Right Hon. Pierre Trudeau to the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen. In that letter Mr. Trudeau wrote:

I would remind you of our decision not to apply the requirements of these guidelines to our spouses and dependent children.

Note the phrase "spouses and dependent children". That came from the Prime Minister of the Liberal Government of the day. Now they say that if a person happens to be married with dependent children, or if his sister is married with dependent children, then that person has committed an outrageous crime. It is an outrageous crime, the appearance of which is so heinous that there is no choice but to submit to this vote of non-confidence and accept that the people of Canada no longer have confidence in that person.

Aside from the sanctimony and outrageous hypocrisy that that sort of attitude exhibits—

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe on a point of order.

**Mr. Tobin:** The Minister knows that he cannot accuse Members of the House of hypocrisy. I know he is familiar with the definition of that word, but he cannot use it and he knows that.

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, apparently the Hon. Member cannot listen without his mouth being in motion. That is the problem.

Throughout the outrage, phoney sanctimony and hypocrisy which we have heard all week no one has acknowledged the fact of the performance of Lawson Murray. They have said: "Never mind the performance. Performance does not matter. What matters is appearance, not performance." Thank goodness the public of Canada would never accept the outrageous premise that if good paint is put on and it looks good it does not matter what is underneath and what the real value is. This Government operates on the basis of value for money. We are trustees of the taxpayers' money and that is how we will act.

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

**Mr. Andre:** Lawson Murray, which, I repeat, was selected by the Ministry of Supply and Services, was paid the outrageous commission of \$26,000 to continue a contract which we inherited from the previous administration. One of the principals of the Liberal agency which had the contract for years said that it was a gravy train and an unnecessary activity. But that agency did not inform the Government of that fact. It collected fees for all those years. Have we heard any outrage from members of the NDP about that fact? It is only taxpayers' money which has been wasted, so why should they get outraged when they can concentrate on appearance? That is so much more important to them than substance. Well, it is not more important than substance. Performance is what counts, not appearance. I repeat, the appearance in this case, if we

look at it with fair eyes, is proper. It is my contract with Lawson Murray on behalf of the Bank of Canada which is a Crown corporation. That will stand up to examination by any fair-minded and reasonable Canadian.

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

**Mr. Andre:** For the glorious sum of \$26,000, Lawson Murray, which we selected on the basis of having people we know and trust—and they have demonstrated that trust, and principle I might add—and on the basis of that agency having the experience and expertise in the area of representing financial institutions, wrote to the Bank of Canada on February 11. That letter included a list of the newspapers in which the ads were placed. The letter read:

This list provides a great deal of waste circulation and duplication—

The letter went on to say that the effective cutting of the unnecessary activities would save the Government \$415,000 a year. The letter continued:

Furthermore, we believe that the placement procedure could be streamlined to save money.

The letter recommended a procedure to the Government in which more money could be saved. I know that it is only taxpayers' money and that that is insignificant to the New Democratic Party, because it only considers appearances to be important. The letter continued:

While I would regret the end of our association and the loss of revenue to Lawson, Murray Limited, I do not feel that we would be responsible were we to advise you differently.

When a Member of Parliament cannot bring himself or herself to recognize what value the taxpayers get from that kind of responsible advice, when they say that it is immaterial and that they do not care about the performance, and instead use spurious and righteous indignation, then that Member of Parliament ought to lose the confidence of the electors because he or she has lost all sense of propriety and responsibility.

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

**Mr. Andre:** In his remarks, the Hon. Member, because he wanted to be fair, said that they do not object to family members participating in Canadian business, provided they are not enriched by the taxpayers. I agree.

**Mr. Deans:** I did not say that.

**Mr. Andre:** Well, provided they are not given the preferential accord, or whatever is the language of the guidelines. I do not know if the Hon. Member knows about what he is talking or suggesting. Of course, obviously he is also referring to relatives by marriage. I checked that out, and in the case of my family it represents 20 companies which cannot do business with the Government. My exempt staff are also under the same conditions, as they ought to be, which represents for my office alone 200 companies. Since there are 39 or 40 Ministers, we are talking about several thousand companies which should be excluded from participating in these contracts.