

Supply

other number. It was Jim Coutts' office. I phoned Jim Coutts' office and asked for Mrs. Guarnieri. When I asked to talk to her, I was told she was in a meeting. I phoned a couple of times but she was always in meetings. Therefore, I made some attempts to talk to these people.

I talked also to civil servants. I asked a question of the Minister yesterday on this matter. It seems to me that I have taken all reasonable steps to show a case. When you put all the evidence together in the face of community support, in face of the connections and in the face of what they were trying to do, it shows that they are now set up to do precisely what they wanted to do as set out in their paper.

I have to tell the Hon. Member that you have to look at the way modern politics operate. When you have all that information, you can use it, and that is precisely what the Liberal Party wants to do. The Hon. Member can disagree with that. I say to the Hon. Member, show me the civil servant's recommendation in detail. Show me the monitoring report. Show me the cost of approving this service. There are two criticisms of the grant. One, it is overlapping, duplicitous and does not make any sense. The second implication beyond all reasonable doubt, it seems to me, is that the evidence leads to it being a political set-up.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member digs himself further in all the time. He says that he tried to talk to people but he admits he has not. He says he does not have any direct contact with any of the principals. He admits that he does not have any concrete evidence, yet he is willing to stand in the House and say two or three things. He is going to give people's names, he is going to say they are engaged in corrupt activity and he is going to say that it is a massive conspiracy, not only on the part of these people but on the part of Members over here.

Let us see if the Member wants to step outside the House and accuse the individuals whose names he has mentioned. Does he have the courage to go outside where he does not have the protection of our rules and blame these people so they can answer him where this belongs, in a court of law? He knows full well that he does not have enough evidence for that. He has a lot of cockamamie theory. Yes, indeed, there is some controversy. COSTI-IIAS raised these concerns. Let us answer that on that level. To go one step further and to take people who are involved in legitimate social work and legitimate political activity and to say that that is wrong or corrupt is great—that's a really good theory! That is what Joseph McCarthy did in the 1950s. If the Hon. Member does not want his name associated with McCarthyism, then step outside and accuse people so that they can answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I seek the co-operation of Hon. Members to make questions and comments as brief as possible.

Mr. Waddell: I will reply briefly. I ask Hon. Members to look at the letters patent and try and find if there is one social worker on it. These are rank amateurs. I said it was the Government that was corrupt, not these people.

Mr. Fisher: Are you willing to go outside?

Mr. Waddell: It was the Minister who did this. It was the Minister who was incompetent through his political job in Toronto and it was the Government that was corrupt in the way that it was giving out these grants.

Mr. Fisher: No, sir, you made specific charges. Go outside.

Mr. Waddell: I said it was the Government that was corrupt.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, in his comments, the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) mentioned that he found nothing to criticize in the way the former Local Initiatives Program, now called Canada Works, was implemented because the system made it possible for him, as an Opposition Member, to have the same say as a Government Member in the final choice of projects.

Personally, I do not have a specific axe to grind, but does the Hon. Member mean he would have no objection to the program if he had been able to do his job in his own riding and make recommendations for suitable projects there?

He is accusing the Government or Government Members of exercising patronage or encouraging more or less worthwhile organizations. I may remind the Hon. Member that a few years ago when we set up the Local Initiatives Program, I know of one instance in Vancouver, maybe in his own riding, where a project had been approved at the recommendation of a Member of Parliament, probably from his own party, for setting up a small farm, where subsequently marijuana was grown. So all Members are not necessarily to blame for choices that turn out to have unfortunate consequences. I think the Hon. Member will have to admit that according to his reasoning, if he had been able to make his own recommendations in his own riding, exercising his own NDP patronage, he would have had no objection to the Program.

[*English*]

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, the whole point is that these other programs are fine. I am a supporter of the other programs. I went to the office of the Canada Works woman who was going out and finding the projects in my riding. That was fine; no one objects to that. The problem with this program, I tell the Hon. Member, is that it was a selective program. Only Liberal members were informed of this program. They were told to go out and get the grants and submit them correctly. It has the wrong kind of process. It ends up with grants like this, which are opposed by the existing community, some of the older services which have been in service for 30 years, the present existing services. It leads to charges of political interference. Indeed, in this particular program I submit there was a political thing happening. It opens up the Government. With