do, are now sitting there chuckling. They think they have scored a few points. You will pay heavily for that kind of jocular attitude with the Canadian people, I can tell you that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: I have responded fully and honestly to the inquiries of my hon. friend.

An Hon. Member: Getting under your skin, eh?

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries in an emphatic statement said this matter was, in detail, in the hands of the Prime Minister. We have had seven examples of how it should have gotten there. Would the Prime Minister admit in this House that he cut the Minister of Fisheries' throat in order to cover his own backside?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: No way.

PRIME MINISTER'S KNOWLEDGE

Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly difficult, in listening to these answers and questions, to avoid the conclusion that the Prime Minister knew about this matter along before he has indicated in this House previously that he did.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: Was he blind, deaf, and dumb?

An Hon. Member: Just dumb.

Mr. Baker: My question to the Prime Minister is this. In view of the questions that have been asked here today, in view of the information that has become public in recent days, in view of that, can he now stand in his place, in retrospect, and say quite honestly that he knew absolutely nothing, nothing at all about this incident prior to that Tuesday night?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can say that and anybody who says anything to the contrary can bloody well put his seat on the line, because it is false.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Getting under your scales, Brian?

INQUIRY OF THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, the bigger scandar here is that the Prime Minister did not know—

Some Hon. Members: Oh. oh!

Mr. Speaker: If the Government benches will permit a question. Supplementary question immediately, please?

Oral Questions

Mr. Baker: With a 54 per cent increase in his staff and 120 people working there—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I invite the Hon. Member to come immediately to the question.

Mr. Baker: My question quite simply, Mr. Speaker, is this. Don't you think you should have known?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gauthier: Where does the buck stop?

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

PLANNED REDUCTIONS IN INSPECTION PERSONNEL

Mr. Bill Attewell (Don Valley East): My question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue concerning the planned cut of customs and excise jobs over the next five years and the planned centralization of examination of international parcel mail. Some Canadians fear that this move may increase the risk of pornography and illegal drugs coming into the country. Would the Minister allay the fears of the Members of this House, and Canadians, about this risk?

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Hon. Member for a very topical and pertinent question and to assure him the reductions in numbers that have been referred to are not nearly as great as those which have been reported. This in no way affects the capacity of the Department to carry out with vigilance what is required to keep prohibited imports from coming into this country. The reductions are designed to improve the payment and delivery and streamline the service, and do not affect the enforcement ability of the Department.

[Translation]

FISHERIES

TUNA AFFAIR—REQUEST FOR EXPLANATIONS CONCERNING TWO OFFICIALS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Everybody is aware now that Ian Anderson, the Head of Communications, and Pat MacAdam, a long-standing friend and adviser of the Prime Minister, were aware of the "Tuna affair" in late July. But curiously enough, neither Anderson nor MacAdam were fired.

My question is this, Mr. Speaker. Must we infer now that they properly did their duty and informed the Prime Minister of the "tuna affair"? If not, the Prime Minister being respon-