

and brothers-in-law are appointed to positions all over the place". It is a real scandal.

Why are these people opposite not able to acknowledge within the framework of their life experience, of their attitude, of the values they hold with respect to patronage, that there has been a conflict of interest, at the very least an appearance of a conflict of interest and, therefore, an example of the judgment of the current Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson)? They are not able to acknowledge it, Mr. Speaker. The direction from which they come at this matter, the mind-set of this Party in power, reflects the attitude of a bunch of children who for too long have been denied access to the cookie jar. That is the reason they cannot understand that a very serious breach of the conflict of interest guidelines has occurred. That is the reason they cannot understand that it is not appropriate for the brother-in-law of the Minister of Finance to receive a contract from the Department of Finance. That is the reason, despite repeated questions, not one single Member opposite has been able to stand in his place with a straight face and answer the questions: Do you agree? Is it appropriate? Not one, Mr. Speaker.

Here is another quote, Mr. Speaker:

For of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each of us, recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state, our success or failure, in whatever office we hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions:

- First, were we truly men of courage . . .
- Second, were we truly men of judgment . . .
- Third, were we truly men of integrity . . .
- Finally, were we truly men of dedication?

Those are the words of John F. Kennedy.

The issue in this debate today and the issue during the week has not been whether the Minister of Finance would have a smoke behind the bicycle shed when he was growing up. That is not the issue. The issue is not even whether the Minister of Finance is a man of integrity or honesty, whether he has exemplified throughout his life in his dealings, private and public, standards with which we would all like to associate ourselves. That is not the issue. The issue is that the Minister has shown extremely bad judgment. We on this side of the House with respect to patronage now see that the skids are greased by this Party and we want to put the brakes on. The issue that has caused Members in both Parties on this side to pursue this issue all through the week, perhaps into next week—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You will be down to 14 per cent in the polls if you do not talk about the real issues.

Mr. Tobin: —is not simply the conflict of interest guidelines. What has bothered Members on this side is that we have not once, despite five days of questions, despite the speeches today, had an acknowledgment, even an acknowledgment, from Members opposite that there is something wrong.

We have heard the Minister of Supply and Services—whom I quoted earlier when he was not a Minister but now is a

Supply

Minister in charge of the most sensitive patronage Department, and if there is the possibility for abuse, it is there—rise and say: "I would do it again". That is the problem. The problem is not just with the Minister of Finance. The problem is that we have given the Prime Minister, the front bench of this Government and the Minister of Finance himself an opportunity to get up and say, "No, it is not acceptable for a brother-in-law of a Minister in charge of a Department to receive a contract from that Department".

Mr. Dick: That is wrong.

Mr. Tobin: We have not even heard in the words of the Prime Minister a little bit of "I am sorry". We have not even heard in the words of the Prime Minister a little bit of "It won't happen again". We have had a Minister of Supply and Services stand and tell us repeatedly over and over during this week: "I would do it again". Who are you trying to fool with this notion? That this company saved us \$500,000? That is absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader should know that the public servant who signed his name on a contract that was given to Lawson Murray to authorize that contract, who is not now employed with the Government and who was interviewed by a reporter this week from *The Globe and Mail*, was quoted as saying: "I don't care what the Minister of Finance says. It was straight patronage". That is the person who signed the contract.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That was your employee.

Mr. Tobin: No. That is the one who signed the contract. You ought to get your facts, straight, Sir. I warn the Government House Leader that we expect him to come forward quickly with their new conflict of interest guidelines. I will be curious to see how they can possibly make them any stronger than the current guidelines, which state categorically—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: I hear a Member shouting. No, they are Mr. Clark's guidelines. There again we all know that the Prime Minister thinks of Mr. Clark. He stood up in Montreal a few years ago and endorsed the leadership of Mr. Clark. He stood up in Montreal and said: "The Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) will remain the Leader of the P.C. Party at the convention and he will do it with my support". That is what the current Prime Minister said. What happened, Mr. Speaker? A little while later the man looked like a porcupine. Of course, the current Prime Minister had no blood on his hands. We know what his word is worth. The Hon. Member for Yellowhead, the former Progressive Conservative Prime Minister, knows what his word is worth. We know what happens when the Prime Minister lowers his voice because we saw him do it on that fateful day in Montreal. He said: "I can assure you that I support the candidacy of the Member for Yellowhead". A little while later he was being hauled out on a bier, rushed into an ambulance and plugged into about four gallons of blood. We know what his word is worth. We are telling you now that the eyes of the people of Canada are upon you. You