

When this came to public light, what happened, Mr. Speaker? It was not the Ministers who were changed. No. It was the guidelines which had to be changed. It was not the Ministers' conduct which was wrong. It was the Prime Minister's guidelines which were wrong. Now we have a task force headed by Michael Starr and Mitchell Sharp which is going to devise a new set of guidelines. Is that not a similar pattern of conduct as the episode of the budget speech and the leak of April 18? There is a budget leak and the Prime Minister produces a magician's hat and says it is no longer a leak because the Government changed it after it was leaked. I can refer you to the actual words of the Prime Minister, as reported in *Hansard* of April 19 at page 24633. He said:

If there is a leak and we change them—

That is, the leak provisions.

—there is no more leak.

That is the reasoning of the Prime Minister. There was a leak. We changed what was leaked. So now it is a leak no longer. At one time you see it, at another time you do not. It is the same as the conflict of interest guidelines. At one time there are guidelines. The Minister violates them. It is not the Minister who is wrong. It is the guidelines which are wrong. Therefore, we redo the guidelines. That is where this Government has ended up after 20 years in power, self-serving, self-seeking. There is nothing too scurrilous or slimy that it will not attempt in its desperate effort to keep itself in office. It has ex-Ministers who will continue to support their former colleagues in those piteous ways. I say, thank God for men like Walter Gordon, who at least had the backbone, the courage, the good sense and credibility to offer his resignation when he made a mistake. You will never see that lot opposite admit to a mistake. You will never see them offer their resignation or put themselves in jeopardy, no matter what. That is because they are determined to stay in power, no matter what happens to their credibility, or whatever.

I do not want to chastise Hon. Members opposite too strongly. It is a waste of time, Mr. Speaker. That is why I am speaking calmly and not getting excited today. I did mention the special recovery program, Mr. Speaker. This is another pattern of this Government. It was supposed to be a special recovery capital projects program in which \$4.8 billion was going to be spent over the next several years, nearly all of it in temporary Liberal districts in this country. In the Province of Newfoundland there are seven federal districts. Two of them are held and represented by Progressive Conservative Members who execute their duties brilliantly. There are five districts represented by Liberal Members, and the less said the better. A lot of them are very busy with their own pursuits at the moment. There are five Liberal districts and two Progressive Conservative districts. Where are the moneys going which are being invested in the special recovery projects in Newfoundland? Why, they are going into the five Liberal districts, with the exception of a highway which they could not avoid having located in the district of St. John's East, because that is where it was. They could not move the highway, the connecting road.

The Budget

I have information which indicates this whole program is political. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the projects which make up that special recovery program—which was one of the Minister's leaks—were approved by people who do not even belong in this House? Otto Lang, the late unlamented Member from Saskatchewan, a former Liberal Minister, decided where these projects should go. He decides for the West. Ron Basford, the late unlamented Minister from British Columbia, decides for British Columbia. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Ouellet) decides for Quebec. And lo and behold, the old Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen), old Allan Twist himself, decides for the Maritimes and Newfoundland. I guess Ontario fits in there somewhere. I think it is under the Minister of Labour as part of the process of increasing our co-operation in this country between the different language groups.

So there are four of them who have to agree. Two of them are not even members of Cabinet, and two of them are not even Members of this House. And they are deciding how \$4.8 billion is being spent. Otto Lang and Ron Basford, turfed out by the voters. I believe Ron Basford resigned before he could be turfed out, but if he gives them another chance, they will turf him out, so there is no doubt about that. Otto Lang, of course, was junked out by the taxpayers. However, these four decide and everything has to be checked by numbers one, two and three. Number one is Mr. Trudeau. Number two is Mr. Pitfield, now in the other place. Number three is Keith Davey, also in the other place. These three, the terrible trio, join the four brutes in deciding where all this money is going to be spent in projects across Canada. You call this government administration? I call it degradation, Mr. Speaker. I believe you are looking at me as if I were getting near the end of my time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. I should indicate to the Hon. Member that he may be getting near the end of his rope, not his time. There is a problem about using the Christian names of Hon. Members. That is a problem for the Chair. I understand that may change shortly and we will not have that problem. However, I would ask the Hon. Member to be kind enough to co-operate in that regard until such time as changes will be made. The other thing I want to say is that, hopefully, he will address his own motion.

● (1530)

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, knowing the great respect I have for him, his patience is monumental and naturally I am going to be guided by his every wish. I am surprised that I am still here and not whisked away somewhere. This is a serious subject, Mr. Speaker, but I am coming near the end. I got going on that special recovery project's business because I did not know how I would be able to get it in otherwise.

To come back to the whole business of budget secrecy, surely it demeans this House and our whole process, surely it lowers us all in the eyes of the Canadian public, if a Minister can make a serious mistake like that and then escape the