

● (1720)

There is another change from the 1960s and 1970s, that is the fact that everything we say now goes directly into the homes of Canadians through the media of television and radio; members are judged a little differently than just by the written word. People in those days had to depend on the objectivity or lack of objectivity of the newspapers to determine what was really going on. Smear and insinuation work well when they are confined to newspapers, but they work less well when heard on television and radio. I suspect Canadians do not particularly appreciate Members of Parliament resorting to tactics to which they would not dare resort 50 feet away from the House of Commons.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. The time provided for the Hon. Member's speech has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow him to continue?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** There is not unanimous consent. Questions. Comments.

**Mr. Regan:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) who has performed so well. I was bothered by the question of the Hon. Member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) about this matter having been carried on openly and not in a sneaky fashion. This seems to indicate that there was no bad intent on the part of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) or the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) who participated in a press conference and television statements. It seems to me that if they had thought there was anything wrong being done for Mr. Gillespie, they would have had him as a silent partner in that consortium with the other businessmen, not up front and centre.

I want to ask a question arising out of that. Is the Hon. Member aware that the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) is from the next seat, the adjacent seat to where this press conference was held, and that he has had a reputation over the years of digging into everything and trying to bring up any muck that he could? Having in mind the fact that he was the only Minister in the Government of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) who did not submit his conflict guidelines report to the Deputy Registrar General within the time limit provided—

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Regan:** —is it what one calls a question of a conscience of convenient time that means that back in 1981, when this matter was announced in his newspapers and in the constituency next door to him, he did not see anything wrong? He would dig around and charge that he was being bugged by the

### *Supply*

Government, when it turned out that he was bugged by the people he hired himself to search his office. Does it not strike the Hon. Member as strange that that Hon. Member did not at that time bring up the question of any impropriety? He had a calendar—he has a calendar, I know, in his office—and he knew who Mr. Gillespie was, but he did not suggest that there was anything wrong. Why do they bring it up now and not two years ago?

**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, it may surprise the Minister if I were to tell him that I was not particularly amused by his question because I am not particularly interested in whether the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) submitted his expense account or whatever he was supposed to submit. It does not bother me. When I talk about a moral conscience in the House, it applies to this side of the House as well as to the opposite. It seems to me that if we have a good case at any time, in debate we can make it without being concerned about the private weaknesses of Members opposite. I know it is difficult to keep the border line, but those who master the technique understand the House better.

I am interested in some of the facts involved and I understand that is good, old-fashioned politics. But to be consistent—and I am—I do not think it has anything to do with the issue. The issue we are debating here—and I direct this to the gentleman who asked the question—is the integrity of the Minister of Finance and whether there is sufficient evidence from the Question Period and today to suggest, insist or prove that there has been any lack of integrity on his part or any wrongdoing.

Surely the Members opposite without conviction with their love for democracy, their concern for justice, would have long ago made a case here, gone the traditional route and challenged the Minister to go before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and put his seat in jeopardy. I am sure they have that integrity, the Members opposite who have participate in Question Period every day. Thus, I can only come to the conclusion that they have not been satisfied that there is sufficient evidence or any evidence of any lack of integrity on the part of the Minister of Finance. Hence, maybe that is why they are falling back on the issue moral standards.

I might say in my reply that some of the questions in recent pays but by Members of the New Democratic Party reflect a healthy hypocrisy on their part. The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) was not too kind and charitable in his reference to Ministers, I think yesterday. I think he almost choked to death in his demand that Members resign. Resign for what? There are some Members of the New Democratic Party, not all, who have obviously demonstrated that sanctimoniousness which has always been one of their characteristics as far back as the thirties, that they are purer than anyone else. I suppose that is the hallmark of a true socialist. If the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River feels so strongly about the Minister of Finance resigning, then he has the time today or on Monday or Tuesday to go the honourable way and make a charge in the House of Commons. Then we would deal with it in the appropriate forum, which is the