

Supply

judgment, to revising some of these guidelines and always giving them the appropriate review.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting to listen to the speeches and comments this morning and this afternoon from Members opposite. They have talked about everything but the issue and the motion which is on the Order Paper. I know that there are people in the gallery who are wondering what this debate is all about. The motion reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the granting of an untendered contract to the brother-in-law of the present Minister of Finance by the Government of Canada is an unacceptable action.

That is what we are discussing. This motion is not an attack on the family unit. It does not demand that every brother, sister, mother, father or cousin of every Member of Parliament or Minister of the Crown should be locked away in Siberia until they have finished their political life.

The motion clearly states that the brother-in-law of a Minister should not be doing untendered business with that Minister's Department. It is not even with another Department or an agency, but with the Minister's Department. That is what happened in this case.

My colleagues in the NDP and we in the Liberal Party have attempted all week to have the Government answer that question. We have asked if the Government believes it is an acceptable practice, but we have never been able to get a straight answer. We have talked about the Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of Quebec and Governments ad infinitum back through history. But we have not talked about this particular instance, at least that side of the House has not.

I have come to the conclusion that if we cannot get a straight answer, then it is really a reflection of the attitude of Members opposite. Who have been the prime defenders opposite? One is the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) who has risen in the House all week. The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence (Mr. Nielsen) has risen in the House a great deal this week. Certainly, it has been the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Andre). He has had a great deal to say. We heard from the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) for the first time today. She talked about bicycles and bicycle sheds and I do not know how that is relevant.

Let us talk about the people who have been the prime defenders. Let me quote a Member of Parliament who spoke in the House on June 21, 1963. He is a very well known Member of Parliament who was talking about patronage and untendered contracts. The Deputy Prime Minister is smiling across the way. What did he say? At page 1434 of *Hansard* on June 21, 1963, the Deputy Prime Minister said:

I would say that it is corrupt, because all that it indicates is a pay-off to political friends for assisting a political party. Patronage is being employed once again in the Yukon territory in order to pay off political friends. I say to the government benches, let us get back to the fair practice of calling for tenders for all public works and services and completely eliminate this ugly practice of

patronage. There is no reason for it, and in my view every Canadian has an equal right to bid for every public work or service that the government required.

Mr. Gauthier: Who said that?

Mr. Tobin: The Deputy Prime Minister.

Mr. Gauthier: You're kidding!

Mr. Tobin: I am not kidding. I am serious.

We know what his attitude is—or was. I regret the loss of innocence between 1963 and 1985. It is amazing what 22 years in this place has done to the high principles, the values and views espoused by the Member opposite.

We see here the loss of innocence. In 1961, in a *Maclean's* magazine article entitled "The Young Canadians", a young promising star on the Canadian political star, the Prime Minister, who was a student at the time, was interviewed as a promising new star in Canada's future. In that 1961 article he was asked what he thought the attitude of a Prime Minister from the new generation of Canadians would be toward patronage. He said:

I think his attitude is going to be drastically changed from the attitude of those who are in government today.

Of course, Mr. Diefenbaker was in Government in 1961. The Prime Minister was forecasting a change.

In the *Saturday Night* magazine in 1976, the same promising young student, the Prime Minister, was now a candidate for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada. What was he saying? How had he matured and grown from his association with the PC Party? The magazine states:

Fifteen years later, in his first leadership campaign, he became fond of quoting Senator Allister Grosart, the former Diefenbaker aide: 'What this party wants is its two feet right in the goddamn trough.'

Here we are in 1985 and they have their two feet right in the—I will not use that foul language—trough.

What did the Conservatives say in 1984, just months before they became the Government? The Minister of Supply and Services stood up in the House and told us that his Government would have a clean act. What did he say? Let us quote him, shall we? He said: "A Progressive Conservative Government would gradually—" The Member was in opposition when he said this. The quote continues: "—replace every one of the 3,300 Liberal Cabinet appointees on federal boards, commissions, and Crown corporations with our people."

● (1540)

What did the Prime Minister say when he was told that the Member for Calgary Centre had made that comment? Was he shocked? Did he deny any association with the man who is now the Minister of Supply and Services? I will tell you what he said, Mr. Speaker. He said: "Wait just a moment. Andre can't count. There is not 3,300 Liberal appointees to be replaced with Tories. There are 3,600 Liberals to be replaced with Tories". That is what the Prime Minister of the day said. He also said at a press conference on July 9, 1984: "Brothers