



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 191

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Monday, May 1, 1995**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 1, 1995

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Ontario is not present to move the order as announced in today's Notice Paper. Accordingly, the motion will be dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence for Private Members' Business, pursuant to Standing Order 42(2).

### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent to suspend until noon, at which time the House could resume its business with Government Orders.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, is there unanimous consent for members present to stay and debate MP pensions for the hour normally otherwise set aside?

**Some hon. members:** No.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11.06 a.m.)

---

### SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 12 p.m.)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### CODE OF CONDUCT

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.)** moved:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to develop a Code of Conduct to guide Senators and Members of the House of Commons in reconciling their official responsibilities with their personal interests, including their dealings with lobbyists;

That seven Members of the Senate and fourteen Members of the House of Commons be the Members of the Committee, and the Members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be appointed to act on behalf of the House as Members of the said Committee;

That changes in the membership, on the part of the House of Commons of the Committee be effective immediately after a notification signed by the member acting as the chief Whip of any recognized party has been filed with the clerk of the Committee;

That the Committee be directed to consult broadly and to review the approaches taken with respect to these issues in Canada and in other jurisdictions with comparable systems of government;

That the Committee have the power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the Committee have the power to report from time to time to send for persons, papers and records, and to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the Committee have the power to retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff;

That a quorum of the Committee be 11 Members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long, as both Houses are represented and that the Joint Chairpersons be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, whenever six Members are present, so long as both Houses are represented;

That the Committee be empowered to appoint, from among its Members, such sub-committees as may be deemed advisable, and to delegate to such sub-committees, all or any of its power except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons;

That the Committee be empowered to authorize television and radio broadcasting of any or all of its proceedings;

That the Committee make its final report no later than October 31, 1995;

That, notwithstanding usual practices, if the Senate is not sitting when the final report of the Committee is completed, the report may be deposited with the Clerk of the Senate and it shall thereupon be deemed to have been presented to that House; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deem advisable, Members to act on the proposed Special Joint Committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in presenting this motion the government is continuing to fulfil its commitment to strengthen public confidence in the institutions of government.

Earlier in this Parliament we revised and strengthened the conflict of interest code for public office holders and buttressed that new code through the appointment of an ethics counsellor for cabinet ministers and order in council appointees. We also proposed amendments to the Lobbyists Registration Act

*Government Orders*

designed to move the lobby industry out of the shadows and backrooms and into the light of public scrutiny.

[*Translation*]

Having done this, we will now concentrate on adopting a code of ethics for members of the House of Commons and senators. We hope that the process triggered by this motion will be based on consensus and co-operation, because this issue affects all parliamentarians in both the House of Commons and the Senate, whatever their political allegiance. That is why this government proposes that this important task be assigned to senators and members of the House of Commons rather than to the government itself. This is further evidence that the government really cares about strengthening the role and effectiveness of Parliament.

[*English*]

We look forward to the deliberations of the committee and we hope that in these deliberations all parties will work together toward preserving the integrity of Parliament. We all have a role to play, a responsibility for ensuring that Parliament, this most fundamental instrument of our democracy, remains an expression of the collective values of all Canadians and one in which they can justly take pride.

What Canadians have made clear is that they want parliamentarians to institute clear rules consistently applied governing their standards of behaviour.

[*Translation*]

The public's political expectations and values have undergone enormous changes over the years.

[*English*]

For example, in the 1950s there was little concern about conflicts between private business and public responsibilities of elected officials. I understand that at that time many ministers directly owned securities and shares of all kinds, without concern about things like blind trusts and so forth, and even held corporate directorships without causing any public concern. Today that would be out of the question.

Over the years the public has developed much higher expectations. As the art of governance has become more and more complex and intermediaries, advocates, and lobbyists of varying stripes have become increasingly present, successive federal, provincial, and even municipal governments have enacted increasingly rigorous measures to meet evolving public expectations about integrity.

Depending on their province of residence, Canadians have witnessed the development of everything from informal guidelines to formal codes of conduct for elected officials and other public office holders. They have seen the appointment of myriad ethics committees or commissioners with varying degrees of impartiality, independence, and powers of investigation. They

have seen politicians subjected to new requirements for disclosure and divestiture. They have seen enacted numerous access to information regimes designed to provide the transparency required for citizens to better examine the activities of public officials.

While the emphasis of these measures has tended to focus primarily on rules of acceptable conduct for the executive, recent trends suggest a growing interest in extending the application of such measures to all public office holders, including those parliamentarians who are not ministers.

(1205)

At our national level, here in the House of Commons alone, over the past eight years no fewer than four conflict of interest bills for members and senators were introduced and died on the Order Paper. That they met such a fate is instructive. It underlines just how difficult the task is of effectively reconciling the right of individual parliamentarians and their families to privacy and to private life with the public's right to expect the highest standards of conduct from those they elect. The balance will not be an easy one to achieve.

Today we are proposing that there be a special joint committee on a code of conduct for parliamentarians structured along the same lines as the highly successful special joint committees that reviewed Canada's foreign and defence policies. That is, we are proposing that fourteen members of the House of Commons and seven members of the Senate form this committee. In addition, we are proposing that the present members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be appointed to act on behalf of the House as members of the new special joint committee.

The special joint committee's task will be a challenging one: to propose a code of conduct to guide senators and members of the House of Commons in reconciling their official responsibilities with their personal interests, including their dealings with lobbyists. The special joint committee will be directed to consult broadly and to review the approaches taken with respect to these issues in Canada and in other jurisdictions with comparable systems of government.

I alluded earlier to the fate of the past four attempts to develop a code of conduct of this sort. Those bills did not die on the Order Paper because there was serious doubt of the need for such measures; they died because there were fundamental disagreements on the specific measures being proposed.

As parliamentarians, we all know how difficult public life can be. Ministers in particular already undergo a daily scrutiny that most Canadians would find unacceptable if it were applied to them. It is important that the new special joint committee be sensitive to this fact throughout its deliberations. I say this because if our democracy is to flourish we must all be concerned

*Government Orders*

about attracting the best people to public life. I believe that an effective code of conduct can and must take this into account.

For example, as public office holders all members of this House are potentially exposed to allegations that in carrying out their public responsibilities they could be improperly furthering their private interests. Not just ministers, but all parliamentarians must confront this in light of recent changes we have put forward to reinforce the role of both standing committees and private members.

As long as parliamentarians have private interests and have responsibilities to consider, review, or propose legislation that may eventually further those interests, this is a reality we have to face. That is why the challenges facing the new special joint committee promise to be daunting.

Consider the principle of transparency. Few could dispute that accountability without transparency is of dubious value. It is therefore scarcely surprising that disclosure has been one of the common threads running through each of the four previous attempts to define a code of conduct and that the disagreement over the scope of disclosure that would be required contributed to their foundering.

Are the disclosure provisions in the conflict of interest code for ministers, which the present government updated in June 1994, a good model for all members and senators, including those who are not ministers? There is a difference in responsibilities.

(1210)

What differences should there be, as a result, in the rules? Just how rigorous should disclosure requirements be for members and senators who are not ministers? Should they apply to them alone? To their spouses as well? To their immediate family members? To whom should disclosures be made and when? At what point does disclosure become intrusive? In short, where should the balance be placed?

Similarly, a revised conflict of interest code for ministers specifies what ministers can and cannot hold by way of assets. It provides clear rules concerning divestiture, either through arm's length sales or by setting up blind trusts. There are also rules in place in cases where assets are not tradable, such as ownership of a private company.

Should some or all of these rules also apply to members and senators who are not ministers? Should these rules apply retroactively or should they be grandfathered? Again, where does the right balance lie?

All members would doubtless agree that principles, no matter how resounding or how inspiring, must be grounded in concrete requirements and must apply clearly to day to day activities if they are to be meaningful and effective.

If the committee eventually recommends a set of principles for parliamentarians regarding potential conflicts of interest that are similar to those in the conflict of interest code for ministers, then several questions would arise. Should the system be based on a self-assessment peer review or scrutinized by an independent third party? How far can or should power to investigate be extended? Should there be an ethics counsellor similar to the one established for ministers? How should this regime mesh with the Criminal Code and the Parliament of Canada Act? Should sanctions be included in a new code for parliamentarians? If so, who should be responsible for their enforcement? Indeed, what legal standing should those sanctions have, if any?

Ultimately, public accountability of elected officials is achieved through the electoral process, through elections. What happens to those who abuse the system or inflict damage to its credibility between elections? What of senators who are not subject to the discipline of the ballot box? How are they to be held accountable on an ongoing basis?

Yet again, the issue comes down to one of balance.

[*Translation*]

At the end of the day, the committee will have to assess the degree to which the public has the right to be informed about the private business of elected officials and appointed senators. These issues will not be easy to settle.

[*English*]

I say to all Canadians that by adopting this motion, members of the House of Commons will be signalling their determination to establish standards for ethical conduct for parliamentarians that are second to none, standards in which all Canadians can take pride.

Therefore, I ask the House to give early and full approval to this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the motion presented by the government House leader with respect to a code of conduct for Canadian parliamentarians is not something new in the history of parliamentary government, let alone democracy in the West. This government's proposal to appoint a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to develop a code of conduct is in keeping with the Liberals' habit of acting as if they had a clear conscience in front of the people while at the same time continuing to scheme behind their backs.

(1215)

Before looking at what this Liberal code of conduct is really about, I would like to draw the attention of the House to specific points of the government motion presented by the government

*Government Orders*

House leader. This motion provides for a committee made up of eight members of the Senate and fourteen members of the House of Commons, as well as the members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. This is absurd, in my opinion.

We, Bloc members, suggest that the membership of this committee be reduced to three members of the Bloc Québécois, two members of the Reform Party and seven Liberal members of Parliament. Twelve elected representatives should be plenty to examine the professional ethics of the members of this House.

**Mr. Boudria:** What about the senators?

**Mr. Bélisle:** I was getting to them, if the hon. member will let me continue. As for the senators, they are living proof of the fact that, historically, the Liberal and Conservative commitment to developing a code of conduct that would truly be enforced is really lip service. We suggest that senators not sit on this committee but set up a Senate committee to develop their own code of conduct.

Another concern is quorum. We object to a quorum which, as the notice of motion stands, does not ensure participation from the official opposition. This principle is not reflected in the wording of the government motion, which states that a quorum of the committee be 12 members. In our view, this wording needs to be changed.

Time and time again over the past 30 years, through all kinds of committee reports and bills that died on the Order Paper, one government after another tried to regulate the conduct of parliamentarians to prevent conflict between private interests and democratic duties. The conflict of interests issue is the most important aspect of parliamentary ethics. I will therefore focus on this aspect and show that there is no real political will behind this government motion.

In theory, the purpose of a code of conduct for elected representatives is of paramount importance. The public expects these people to be able, to the extent that it is possible, do as they please as concerns their economic interests. However, it also expects that, in the performance of their duties, public office holders will not become involved in business in which they have a personal economic interest. It goes without saying that conflict of interest rules must be based on the principles of impartiality and integrity.

Decision makers cannot be deemed impartial and honest if they personally profit, or can profit, from decisions. Most conflict of interest rules governing parliamentarians are incorporated in three acts of Parliament, namely: the Criminal Code, the Parliament of Canada Act and the Canada Elections Act. For example, the Parliament of Canada Act prohibits a parliamentarian from receiving any outside payment for services

performed regarding any issue reviewed by the House, the Senate, or the committees of the House or of the Senate.

The same act also provides that a person cannot be elected to the House of Commons if this person has, directly or indirectly, a contract with the government which involves public money. The case of a parliamentarian who does not receive public money but is entitled to other benefits under a contract, is probably not covered by that provision, but this issue is far from being clear.

Moreover, if a parliamentarian is a shareholder of a corporation which was awarded a government contract, the ban only applies if the contract concerns the performance of public works. Consequently, a parliamentarian could invest in a corporation and thus avoid the ban. This, you will agree, is quite a loophole.

There is of course no obligation to divulge one's financial interests. However, Standing Order 21 of the House of Commons provides that no member is entitled to vote on any question in which he or she has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested will be disallowed.

(1220)

I am only reminding the House of these rules of conduct for Canadian parliamentarians because the events of the past few years, and in particular this government's conduct, have made people rather sceptical about the Liberal government's political will to set a code of ethics to make public affairs fully transparent.

The two parties which have been in power over the past 30 years have pussyfooted around this crucial issue and have lacked the political will to introduce a serious law strictly governing their own conduct as parliamentarians.

In 1973, the federal government published a green paper called "Members of Parliament and Conflict of Interest". A brief summary of what has transpired over the last 30 years is that the two parties which have held power, the Liberals and the Conservatives, have never really had the political will to set a code of ethics for the elected.

The document I just mentioned proposed consolidating and widening the scope out the rules already in effect. The House of Commons Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and a Senate committee reviewed the green paper and made many recommendations. On June 10, 1975, the standing committee introduced its report on the green paper, which, in general, approved its contents and recommended a few changes.

Two years later, on June 26, 1978, Bill C-62, the Independence of Parliament Act, along with new Rules for the House and the Senate, was introduced in the House of Commons. This bill died on the Order Paper when the session ended on October 10, 1978.

*Government Orders*

However, on October 16, 1978, a slightly modified version of the same act was introduced as Bill C-6. The accompanying Rules for the House and the Senate were tabled in the House on October 30, 1978. The bill was referred to committee on March 8, 1979, but there was no ensuing action and the bill died on the Order Paper when Parliament was dissolved on March 26, 1979.

At the end of the Liberal's term of office, on July 7, 1983, a federal study group was set up to examine the principles and rules governing conflict of interest and their evolution and to decide whether the issue should be dealt with differently. The report did not appear until May 1984. It was entitled "Ethical Conduct in the Public Sector" and was known as the Starr-Sharp report.

With a new government, there were new political practices. On November 15, 1985, the Conservative government asked the Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services to consider the appropriateness of setting up a register of members' interests. As part of its work, the committee was to decide whether it was appropriate to disclose the remuneration members received for sitting on the boards of directors of public or private firms or for performing other duties or occupying other positions in various organizations.

After consulting the members of all parties, the committee concluded that there was no need to set up such a register and that existing legislation on members' conflicts of interest was sufficient. And the saga continues. In February 1988, Bill C-114, Members of the Senate and House of Commons Conflict of Interest Act, was given first reading.

In September 1988, the legislative committee on Bill C-114 met three times, but was unable to finish considering the bill before Parliament was dissolved, on October 1, 1988.

In November 1989, the scenario was repeated with the first reading of Bill C-46, Members of the Senate and House of Commons Conflict of Interest Act. This bill was essentially the same as Bill C-114, with a few minor changes.

This bill died on the Order Paper when Parliament was prorogued on May 12, 1991. November 1991 marked the first reading of Bill C-43, Members of the Senate and House of Commons Conflict of Interest Act. This bill was almost identical to the bills I have already mentioned: Bill C-114 and Bill C-46.

(1225)

Incidentally, the bill was immediately referred to a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons.

In March 1993, first reading of Bill C-116, the Conflict of Interests of Public Office Holders Act, which included amendments to the Parliament of Canada Act. Finally, in June 1993, a report from the Special Joint Committee of the House of

Commons and the Senate recommended that Bill C-116 be set aside. The same day, a similar report was tabled in the Senate. Bills C-43 and C-116 died on the Order Paper, upon dissolution of the 34th Parliament on September 8, 1993.

This whole process, illustrating how the issue of a code of ethics for Canadian parliamentarians has been dealt with, is a political masquerade. All to make the Liberals feel good about themselves and rationalize the federal view of democracy in Canada.

Throughout the election campaign in the fall of 1993, the Liberal Party of Canada maintained that ethics would be an important aspect of its mandate. In the Speech from the Throne in January 1994, the government said that integrity and public trust in the institutions of government were essential. It would therefore appoint an ethics counsellor who, it was hoped, would be a symbol of government integrity and a guarantee of public trust.

However, as far as the most important aspect of the code of ethics—conflict of interest—is concerned, the ethics counsellor appointed by the federal government continues to report to the Privy Council and has no independent powers of investigation. He continues to report to the Prime Minister himself.

The Liberal Party's red book pointed out, and I quote: "The integrity of government is put into question when there is a perception that the public agenda is set by lobbyists exercising undue influence away from public view".

Recent events have shown that the whole Liberal strategy of a code of ethics for parliamentarians, as confirmed in the government motion before the House today, is just another way to deceive the public.

For instance, the provisions of the Broadcasting Act, which is the responsibility of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, do not mean much when faced by the powerful lobby of Power DirectTv, headed by André Desmarais, the Prime Minister's son-in-law. The Liberal government has even stooped to defend concepts dear to the hearts of Mulroney Conservatives and is now singing the praises of competition on a North American scale.

Reading the orders from the Minister of Canadian Heritage, we get the impression that Power Corporation is calling the shots and we can kiss democracy goodbye, in a federal system where capital is still king. We should be concerned about the narrow view taken by our institutions and our political representatives in this case. The government not only ignored its own legislation and the CRTC, which is responsible for implementing that legislation, it also introduced retroactive measures that will prevent Expressvu from launching its service next September. And all this in the name of competition. Meanwhile, the red book's ethics counsellor is camping in the Prime Minister's waiting room.

*Government Orders*

And what about a recent trip to Los Angeles by this same minister of Canadian Heritage, to meet the leaders of the US film industry, at the very moment that the Seagram consortium was acquiring MCA. At issue is the fact that MCA had a Canadian subsidiary, Cineplex Odeon. Investment Canada, which reports to the Minister of Industry, will have to determine the nationality of Seagram. If this company turned out not to be Canadian, the Department of Canadian Heritage would then have to issue a notice of validity for the takeover. Obviously, the real reason the Minister of Canadian Heritage travelled to Los Angeles was to assure the Liberals' friends at Seagram that Ottawa would give favourable consideration to the deal.

While the Government House Leader is tabling a motion calling for the establishment of a special committee responsible for developing a code of conduct for parliamentarians, behind the scenes this very government is flouting the most basic rules of democracy by favouring the friends of the Liberal Party and governing on behalf of the financial establishment and those with big money in Canada.

(1230)

Before closing, I would like to go over in this House some elements of the Bloc Quebecois's dissenting report on Bill C-43 to amend the Lobbyists Registration Act.

As I said, conflicts of interest and lobbyists' activities are the main issues to be addressed in developing a code of ethics governing the activities of parliamentarians in modern democracies.

Western democratic institutions are currently facing a public credibility gap, as you will agree. A good example is the percentage of people who voted in the last presidential election in the U.S. Clearly, it has now become necessary to restore the public's confidence in government. If this goal is to be achieved, public policies must be discussed, debated, amended and, above all, set openly and publicly. This concern is at the heart of the society we plan to build in Quebec. Among other things, we want to leave the federal political scene because it has been dominated for too long by the Liberals' political scheming.

As we have seen, once in office, this government considerably watered down the commitments it had made in its red book during the fall 1993 election campaign. This about-face has raised in the people's minds legitimate questions regarding the Liberal government's real desire to develop a code of ethics for parliamentarians. Given the gap between election promises and concrete legislative measures, we can only conclude that the final version of Bill C-43 was probably dictated by lobbyists.

The Bloc Quebecois feels that, to restore the integrity of our democratic institutions, we must first do away with the futile commitments of the last 30 years, which mislead voters. We must also ensure that the administration of government business is as open as possible, in order to eliminate grey areas and assure the people that policy decisions are consistent with the general interests of the population and not those of powerful lobby groups.

After only 17 months in office, this government already has a long record attesting to its lack of openness. In addition to the examples mentioned earlier and to the damning legislative record with respect to a parliamentary code of conduct, we will recall that, on September 26, 1994, Canadian Press reported that, according to documents obtained under the Access to Information Act, lobbyists had met repeatedly with government members in the months leading to the tabling of the current Bill C-43 and others had threatened to take their case to court if the legislation required them to disclose their political ties. That takes some doing, Mr. Speaker.

In that case, as in many others, lack of transparency made it impossible for the public to know the nature and extent of lobbyists' efforts regarding Bill C-43. Ironically, lobbyists have managed to influence the development of legislation designed to limit their influence. Let us face it, as it stands, Bill C-43 is of no use to prevent the kind of troubling events surrounding the privatization of Pearson Airport or the matter involving the heritage minister himself.

What is worse, according to Mitchell Sharp himself, the Prime Minister's senior counsellor on matters of ethics, even if Bill C-43 had been in force at the time the discussions concerning the privatization of terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson Airport took place, the public would not have been better informed. The majority report on Bill C-43 tabled by the government members on the committee is a timid attempt to regulate the activities of lobbyists and ensure transparency in the management of government.

Again, the government's attitude in this matter shows that what the Liberals say about ethics has no foundation. They are only trying to soothe their consciences and look good in front of the electorate.

The business of the letter in support of an application for a licence that the Minister of Canadian Heritage wrote to the CRTC, a supposedly independent agency under his authority, brought to light the flaws of Bill C-43 with respect to the role of the ethics counsellor himself. We will recall that the Prime Minister delayed seeking the counsellor's advice on this thorny matter for more than three weeks.

(1235)

By waiting so long and consulting the ethics counsellor only at the last minute, after he had made his decision, the Prime

Minister showed his lack of consideration for the ethics counsellor. The head of the Liberal government simply wanted to add another adviser to his staff. The appointment of an ethics counsellor, following a commitment made by the Liberals during the election campaign, was only a ploy designed to give to the public the impression that the government was taking concrete measures to ensure the integrity of Canadian institutions. The Bloc Québécois believes that the issues of ethics, transparency and public confidence in democratic institutions and management of government business are not the prerogative of a political party, a government or a Prime Minister but, rather, of democratic institutions as a whole.

This is why, in its dissenting report, the Bloc recommended that the ethics counsellor be appointed by Parliament for a period of seven years, during good behaviour.

The Pearson airport scandal, in Toronto, provided a clear example of the laxness of the current disclosure rules concerning the activities and dealings of lobbyists. In its report, the Bloc insisted that lobbyists must disclose the representations they make to federal officials regarding legislative proposals. The Bloc essentially recommended that all lobbyists be forced to disclose the contracts for which they try to influence the federal administration.

We tabled over 20 amendments in committee regarding Bill C-43. All were rejected by government members who, in several cases, were not present when testimonies were given, and who did not take part in the discussions in recent months. We were hoping that the new rules, or at least the direction and commitments of the Liberal Party of Canada, would ensure full dress debate of such a vital issue for a democracy. The motion tabled by the Liberal government to appoint a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to develop a code of conduct is just another measure following many others which never helped change political habits in this country.

The Liberals' intentions regarding the development of a code of conduct, which reflect those of the Seagram family and Power Corporation, are only intended to fool the public and give the government good political conscience.

In conclusion, I would like to table an amendment to the government's motion. I propose, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse:

That the motion be amended:

- (a) by deleting, in the first paragraph, the words "Special Joint", "of the Senate" and "Senators and";
- (b) by deleting, in the second paragraph, the words "seven Members of the Senate and";
- (c) by replacing, in the eighth paragraph,
  - (i) the figure "11" with the following: "8";

### *Government Orders*

- (ii) the words "Houses" with the following: "opposition parties";
- (iii) the words "Joint Chairpersons" with the following: "Chairperson";
- (d) by deleting, in the ninth paragraph, the words "Senate and";
- (e) by deleting the twelfth paragraph;
- (f) by deleting the thirteenth paragraph.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair will take this amendment under advisement and rule accordingly later today. Resuming debate. The hon. member for Elk Island.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a delight to be here this morning to address the motion before us. The question of ethics and conduct of members of Parliament and the Senate is a very important issue to Canadians.

I regret that almost immediately after I became a member of Parliament people began attributing to me characteristics I did not possess. Immediately they said because I was now in politics I must be such and such. They made all sorts of allegations and accusations which are not true. I like to think that having become a member of Parliament has not immediately blighted my character. The question of how we deal with perception of Canadians on ethical matters is of great importance.

(1240)

I applaud the government for at least having the courage to begin the debate. I also have a fear that in this debate as in others we may have more smoke and mirrors, more symbolism than substance. We must have a mechanism which will satisfy the anxieties of Canadians when they feel their politicians are not behaving correctly.

The Order Paper indicated the committee producing this code of conduct is comprised of eight members of the Senate and fourteen members of the House of Commons. The solicitor general indicated there were to be seven members of the Senate. I presume seven is the correct number since that is what he said and the Order Paper must have been changed. Perhaps we could get clarification on that in the future. Whether there are seven or eight is irrelevant to my debate, and so I do not need that answer immediately. We will want to get that clarified.

In my previous profession I was a mathematics teacher in high school for four years and then at a technical institute for 27 years. Very early in my teaching career at high school some 30 years ago I had a debate with my students. The question was why should they respect me.

I still remember the essence of that debate. It helped me then to solidify a principle which I have kept all my life up to this point. I appealed to my students. I said let us start off with the premise that because of my position I am worthy of respect, instead of the one that I am not worthy of respect.



*Government Orders*

Then I said: "Let us not leave it there. As you get to know me better as I work as your teacher I hope I will be able to earn your respect. You will find I know my subject well, am able to communicate it and that I am fair in my marking". In all these different aspects of a teacher's life there would be a development of a respect which was earned.

With all due respect to the government's intention of having a joint committee to form a code of conduct the bottom line is, has been and will continue to be that those of us elected to public office will have to earn that respect. To a large degree that is an individual effort.

Some people, whether there is a code of conduct and/or a code of ethics which is greatly detailed, will not live up to it. They will lose the respect of the voters in their constituencies and probably throughout the country. Others, whether there is a code of conduct or a code of ethics or not, will generally behave in an honourable way. I like to think that will be the majority of us.

Allegations of dishonesty and others against politicians are the attribution I believe of the characteristics of very few to the greater number. In a way that is most regrettable, but it is an opportunity for us to take some action to correct the misperceptions and incorrect behaviour.

(1245)

The purpose of the committee is to produce a code of conduct to guide senators and members of the House of Commons in reconciling their official responsibilities with their personal interests, including their dealings with lobbyists. The motion has come out of Bill C-43 to amend the Lobbyists Registration Act. These items are tied together.

I have a substantial question. How did it ever happen that we need to address this question? Most lobbyists do not waste too much time with members of Parliament; they go to the the loop of power. They will go to deputy ministers and cabinet ministers. They will try to influence the Prime Minister. They will probably try to influence anybody who has the power or the authority to make decisions.

We now have need for a code of conduct that will address the question of what kind of activity or what kind of dialogue is morally acceptable between a lobbyist and a person in a position of power.

Our democracy has gone awry. If these matters were working correctly we would have each member of Parliament faithfully and dutifully representing the wishes of his or her constituents. There would be open debate in this place and in committees. There would be freedom from coercion from the party. As a member of Parliament I would have freedom to express in both the debate and in the vote the wishes and aspirations of my constituents.

We have lobbyists who try to influence public policy, which is an aberration of the democratic process. I applaud the process. It is necessary given the way things work around here. It should be unnecessary because we would not even contemplate permitting special interest groups and lobby groups to be the sole determiners of public policy.

We also have the question of procurement, which is probably the larger one. The government is the largest doer of business in the country. To be successful in an enterprise often means being successful in gaining government contracts. In some instances individuals basically get set up for life because they were successful in that regard. To be able to get a government contract we have the scenario of lobbyists affecting the decision maker.

It seems there are two levels of lobbying. I may be wrong. I am relatively new here but I have done some study of it and I have kept my eyes and ears open. There are two levels on a continuum. At one end end of the spectrum we have totally legitimate representation of what a firm or company can do. We have its track record in producing what it contracted to produce and the quality of the product or the service. It is straight information gathering. If procurement in government were handled correctly, they would be part of the conditions of contracts when bids are let, and I believe they are. That information goes on the public record as part of the decision making in letting a contract.

(1250)

Another kind of lobbying is the one we need to address. It has people, and rightly so, greatly upset. I am referring to the mechanism whereby the subtle pressure or influence is probably not deep enough to warrant a judicial investigation: "You are my friend" or a friend of a friend "and we would like to be given special consideration because of that".

I do not think it happens a great deal, but there are certainly a lot of suspicions about it happening too often when we consider the reaction of Canadians and talk about the issues with them. I cannot help but think of some specific instances in the area for which I am critic. It is very negative that allegations are even made.

We always get the message that the situation has been misunderstood, that we do not have the facts and that the allegations are false. We have not had it in the past and I regret that with the changes in Bill C-43 and with the motion we are not likely to have a mechanism with the authenticity to satisfy the questions Canadians have.

As I said in my speech on Bill C-43, we have two kinds of problems. One is where there are allegations of wrongdoing and the allegations are accurate. We need to have a mechanism to identify the allegations and bring the responsible people to accountability. I do not believe Bill C-43, the present Lobbyists

*Government Orders*

Registration Act or the motion and the possible outcome of the committee's work will actually answer that question. It should but I do not think it will. I ask the House to pardon my scepticism.

Then we have the other problem which is just as important. It has to do with the basic principles of law. I have had a lot of opportunity to discuss matters of government and related issues with students, especially with respect to the Young Offenders Act. We often get quite distinct overreactions to how harsh the law should be.

I had a discussion with some students not long ago. We came to the conclusion that the law had two functions in which it must be very accurate. It must accurately declare innocent the people who are truly innocent. It is not acceptable in our legal system to declare people guilty who are truly innocent. We must declare them innocent if they are. That is mostly done and is an aspect of the motion that I think is being missed. If an allegation is made that has no basis in fact, we do not have the mechanism to declare in a persuasive way that things are well. That is the missing element.

I have already mentioned the other part: if an allegation is made and there is guilt, the process of law, if it is court or this process here, should accurately declare guilty the guilty people. I am more concerned about allegations toward innocent people.

There have been cries from the government in the last several weeks on the issues we have brought forward. Allegations are being made and the government keeps saying there is nothing wrong and that nothing has gone bad. Can we believe that? We do not have an independent person, an independent ethics counsellor who can be trusted because he is at a reasonable distance from the government.

(1255)

I would like to say something peripherally. Last weekend I was talking to some constituents back home. Their concerns have to do with much broader issues than even the points I have been making so far. The Solicitor General mentioned one of the concerns in his intervention. He wants to remove from people's perception that public office holders are able to use their offices for their own advantage.

With great concern several people in my constituency raised the issue of the MP pension plan. That is probably the greatest private interest exercised by members of the government. It is an instance where every one of them benefits from his or her position. They are in positions as members of Parliament to vote themselves an outrageously excessive pension plan compared to private industry. It is outrageously excessive compared to what is allowed in the Income Tax Act for private citizens. If that is

not conflict of interest I do not know what is, but we have no mechanism to deal with it. That is a little aside from the main thrust of what I am speaking about today.

I have another concern with regard to the committee. It has a fair number of members. It is directed to consult broadly and review the approaches taken with respect to the issues in Canada and in other jurisdictions with comparable systems of government.

I am to be asked by my party to be one of the representatives on the committee. Frankly I have a bit of fear that for some 20 members plus staff this spells travel all over the world. The committee will probably want to go to Australia to see how it is done there. Maybe it will want to go to Singapore to see how it is done there. Maybe it will want to go to Thailand, England, Germany, France, Spain and Italy. It will go on and on; it will have to travel to a number of the states of the United States to investigate fully and consult broadly.

I am prejudging but it has happened so often that when a committee is struck its travel and expenses escalate right out of sight. I do not think Canadian taxpayers have the stomach to foot \$20 million or \$30 million for the study of something so self-evident that it should not be necessary. Here we are doing it and giving broad ranging rights or commitments to the committee that it have all these powers.

I urge the government at some stage before we are asked to vote to say that it will limit the expenditures of the committee to a stated figure. Why do committees not have a budget they have to live within? That is a missing element.

Other clerical points are stated. I would comment on them but I am running out of time. I want to state one more issue with respect to whom we will hear from. I am afraid the committee will listen primarily to us, that is we shall listen to ourselves. Once again we will have the fox proclaiming he did not eat the chicken. We need to ensure the witnesses at the committee present broad points of view and not just listen to MPs and senators who are primarily affected by the rules and the code to be produced.

(1300)

We need to listen to Canadians. We need to listen to the taxpayers and wage earners. For example, this past weekend I talked to one young couple who are on UI. They have no reasonable hopes for a job. They are paying the bills. Those are the people we should be listening to on this matter, to see what expectations they have of public office holders.

It is mandatory that we have input from ordinary Canadians on issues such as this. They are continually left out of having influence on these decisions. They are not asked. They are given

*Government Orders*

no choice. They are told to pay the bills and are coerced to do it through taxation.

I strongly recommend that if the committee does its work and does it well and there could be an independent ethics counsellor to enforce it, then there would be some gains. This committee should do its work very thoroughly. Because of the lack of an independent ethics counsellor, the work of this committee is ever so much more important.

It is pivotal that this committee do good work to come up with a very clear, well defined code of conduct. I would like to see it get into some of the ethical matters as well. It helps to deteriorate the respect of government when members of Parliament and senators break laws which are part of the Criminal Code with increasing frequency. That issue is not being addressed. We need to address it in a very emphatic and strong way.

**Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I too have a few words to say in support of the motion put forward by my friend and colleague, the government House leader and solicitor general. It is a very good government initiative. I want to respond ever so briefly to my two colleagues who just preceded me, the gentleman from Elk Island and the gentleman from La Prairie.

I heard my good friend the former high school teacher, as I am, talk about stereotyping politicians. I could not agree with him more. As an educator, like him I am sure, I had some standing in education before coming into politics. I found that the morning after, all the people who had previously sought my opinion on education matters had no interest at all in my opinion even on education matters.

There was a stereotyping, as he said. There was the suggestion that he had acquired some new characteristics simply because he had been labelled as an elected politician. I identify very much with what he said on that issue.

I say to him kindly that he should not fall into his own trap. He should not do what he, in the previous mouthful, condemned others of doing. I identify with him that the stereotyping is unfortunate. In his very next sentence he proceeded to say: "I hope this government does not do what all the other governments have done".

I ask him to allow the same suspension of judgment on this issue that he asked people to accord him as a newly elected politician. This is a newly elected government. It was elected the same day he was elected. I think he understands exactly what I am saying.

I identify also with the comment he made about no code. A code cannot be written tightly enough or properly enough to address the situation in its fullness. Finally one comes back to the respect that people must earn. I would like to elaborate on that a little later.

(1305)

*[Translation]*

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for La Prairie expressed some concerns about the quorum of the special joint committee. I am sure the hon. member knows perfectly well that what he is suggesting does not even exist in the case of the House, and for good reason.

*[English]*

My friend from La Prairie suggested that the proposed committee ought to have the provision that the opposition would have to be present for a quorum to be in effect. He should think about that for a moment. I am sure he means well, but he should really think about it. He is asking that the committee have an authority that no other committee of the House has, nor does the Chamber, and for very good reason. Just think about it for a moment.

Let us apply it to the Chamber. If the Chamber had the requirement that we could do not do business unless there was a member of the opposition present, we would then give to the opposition, the minority in normal times, the right to boycott business. Therefore, it could prevent business from taking place.

The framers of the provisions that make this place function, and in Westminster and elsewhere, wisely saw the trap of that kind of proposal. That is why in the Chamber technically we can do business with only the government party present, provided there is a sufficient number of people in the House, that a quorum is present. That is the way it ought to be. Technically that is the way it can happen, but it very rarely happens that way.

As my friend from Elk Island is anticipating by his comment a moment ago, committees are the masters of their own rules. There is nothing in this resolution before us now to prevent the committee from setting out certain ground rules as to how it operates, who shall be present for taking of evidence, what members should be present for making decisions and so on. In that context, the committee itself can address the issue my friend from La Prairie has raised.

Let me appeal to members of the House to first demolish the very prevalent myth that what is seen on the television news every evening and what is heard on the radio news every day is typical of what happens in this House. That is a very big myth.

I will put it into terms for the people who do not sit here. Imagine for a moment that you had a camera on you for every hour of your eight or ten hour working day in your own life as a housewife, carpenter or teacher. Suppose you had a camera on you for every moment of the day. Would you be deadly serious for all of those eight hours? Would there be times when you would be less committed to your immediate objectives than at

*Government Orders*

other times during the day? Would there not be times when you might show a little fatigue or a little annoyance if you had a camera on you every minute of your working day? That is the way it is in the Chamber.

(1310)

Couple that fact with another. Members of the news media are not paid to report the mundane. Something they see here may be quite effective and quite productive, but if in their characterization it is mundane or run of the mill and ordinary, they are not going to report it.

What makes the evening news is the atypical, the stuff that does not represent the cross section of what goes on here. What goes on here to the outsider is by and large fairly boring, I have to admit. It is fairly mundane. If they were to report that as a matter of course, the news media may well lose their positions in the ratings. I understand why certain things are reported on the evening news. I understand that well and I do not debate it. Do not be hoodwinked by the myth that what is seen on the evening news is representative of what goes on here. Anyone who sits here knows it is not representative.

Let us deal with the myth that histrionics and theatrics are somehow evil tools in the conduct of public business. Mr. Speaker, you and I in our family situations, in our social situations, in our church situations use theatrics and histrionics. It is part of our stock and trade. How mundane would life be if we felt the need to speak in unmodulated monotones all the time?

The idea that somehow to make a point here we should not get the fellow's attention first is an idea that runs contrary to the way we operate when we go into the salesroom to buy a car, to make a purchase or to deal with our neighbour about where his fence should not be. It is part of our nature to use histrionics. Do not ask me to shake off my basic nature when I come in here.

The 90,000 people in Burin—St. George's who elected me elected me for a number of reasons. I say me. We can extrapolate that and say any member in the Chamber. I assume they elected me because of what I am and who I am, warts and all. Maybe they saw some assets in some of the warts in terms of their capacity to be represented, for me to be their voice here. They did not tell me to become a robot, a voting machine. They told me: "Go up and show them some of your guts. Tell them what you feel about rural Newfoundland". That is called theatrics. That is called expressing it from the gut. Take that out of Parliament and we can write all the codes of conduct we want but we will not have a very effective Parliament.

Accountability is central to the functioning of this place. Accountability to the people of Canada. I will fill in the blanks for the member for Elk Island if he is not sure of what I am saying.

**Mr. Epp:** Why?

**Mr. Simmons:** I say in fairness to my good friend from Elk Island that we can do this one of two ways: question and answer, or the way I did with him which was to listen to what he had to say. If he has some questions, there is a 10-minute period after and he can ask me all the questions he wants to ask. I do not mind the other way because I like the thrust of spontaneous debate. I have a certain train of thought going and I would like to keep it going for at least one minute. My attention span is not very long. It gets even shorter when I get intelligent fellows like the member for Elk for Island picking on me.

(1315)

Accountability to the people of Canada is central to the functioning of Parliament. If the histrionics and theatrics are removed, we lessen the chance of accountability. Any prime minister or minister, of whatever party stripe, can craft a good neat answer that will cover his or her rear end if there is time to do it. But use the element of surprise, use some theatrics and histrionics during question period and we will get the unvarnished truth sometimes. That is why we have question period, so we can have some of that unvarnished, unrehearsed accountability.

Members may ask what this has to do with the motion that there be a committee to look at a code of conduct. It has everything to do with it. I have a particular fear about this committee. I support the motion wholeheartedly. It is a good idea, but I fear that when the committee sits down to do its work, it might get over-anxious about its mandate or misinterpret its mandate or go beyond its mandate altogether.

The committee should keep in mind it is not dealing with a bunch of angels here, nor should it be. It is dealing with people who represent a cross section of Canada. Canadians for all their goodness by and large are not angels. Do not try to write a code of conduct that would do credit to the angels.

As my friend from Elk Island said, using other words a little earlier, the ultimate functioning of this place is predicated, as it ought to be, on the integrity of those elected to serve here. Those who abuse the trust given to them by the electorate will be dealt with not by any committee, not by any code of conduct. They will be dealt with by the electorate as they ought to be.

At the same time the proposed code of conduct is needed and must have teeth. I do not want a lot of flowery expressions, however laudable, from this committee about what I ought to be doing here. I have a fairly good idea of what I ought to be doing here. I would rather have some provisions that would help me to ensure that I do the right things and if I stray from the narrow path, will discipline me for doing so.

The practice of parliamentary immunity is one that we need. We want to allow freedom of expression in the Chamber. I want to be able to say everything I need to say on behalf of the people who sent me here without fear of being dragged into a court of law. That is why we have parliamentary immunity. The flip side

*Government Orders*

of the coin is that the irresponsible person can use parliamentary immunity as a shield for irresponsible behaviour. It has been done.

(1320)

In the context of this proposed code of conduct here is what I suggest. This is just by way of example. I suggest that the code include a provision that if a member stands in his or her place and makes an allegation which is subsequently established to be unfounded, that the member be disciplined, with the caveat that if the person did it unwittingly and it could be demonstrated that he or she did it unwittingly, then it is a different issue.

There are many examples. I have seen in the Chamber, and in the other chamber in which I had the privilege of sitting in Newfoundland, members rise to espouse positions, to make allegations and to enter into character assassinations and smear jobs using information which they knew to be blatantly false. They had it both ways. They said it in the chamber and, therefore, they could not be taken into a court of law to prove the allegation. It would be reported by a press person in the gallery what was alleged and the damage was done.

Therefore, I appeal to the committee to ensure that whatever code of conduct it crafts it be one that has some teeth in its enforcement.

I have had much pleasure in supporting the motion, not as my hon. friend from Elk Island implied because I have been told to, but because I have great faith and a great belief that it is the way to go.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I really enjoyed the intervention of the hon. member for Burin—St. George's, as I always do. He speaks with eloquence and with humour, which is a very good mixture.

He talked about how often allegations are made which are unfounded. That is the point we are failing to address. When someone in the government is accused of something, rightly or wrongly, it is the mechanism of government that comes to his or her defence. We must have the independence of the auditor general in the body of the ethics counsellor so that he or she is seen to be totally independent of any influence and can put the right spin on the investigation. That is the missing link. I believe that is the Achilles' heel of Bill C-43 and this motion.

I ask the hon. member to expand on his remarks on accountability to the Canadian people. I know what he will say, so I will anticipate that and ask the second question.

He will probably say that every time there is an election the people of his constituency and every constituency across the country have the right to turf out their MP in favour of another MP, another party or whatever. That is the usual stock answer we receive. How does the Canadian voter ever get to vote on issues which were not a part of the election campaign? They have no input.

I observe there is a great deal of party discipline. People vote not the way their constituents tell them to vote but the way they are told to vote. It is obvious to me and I wonder whether it is not also obvious to the hon. member.

**Mr. Simmons:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend from Elk Island.

Without instructing the committee on what it should do, I am hoping that it will look very hard at the idea of an independent ethics counsellor. It should be an ethics counsellor separate from the one that advises the government. In my view they are two distinct entities. A person trying to do both would be in a conflict of interest. I would like to see an independent ethics counsellor under the aegis of the mandate of this committee.

(1325)

The member is in danger of getting into circular arguments about consulting the electorate. I consulted the electorate in October 1993 when I was elected. It just so happened we did not have in front of us the 1,017 items we are going to deal with. Therefore I could not ask them to vote 1,017 times for this and against this. I am glad we did not because that is not the way Parliament operates.

They did not elect me to come to Ottawa to vote for or against gun control or anything else. They elected me on the basis of my being able to use my best judgment and being accessible to them to ensure that my judgment is influenced by what they think on particular issues. That means I have to be accessible.

I was in my riding in Newfoundland this past weekend, the weekend before and I will be there four days from now. I cannot do any more unless I spend all my time there and no time here. I have to speak for me only. I am very accessible to the people I represent. I know their points of view and I believe I relay them faithfully.

If we carry this idea to the extreme we will not need members, we will just need 27 million buttons where everybody pushes a button next to where they operate the electric can opener or microwave. It will be a parliamentary button saying how they will vote. Today they will vote on taxes, tomorrow on paved

roads and the next day on something else. It might be a workable system in some ways but the system we have is also workable. I advocate continuing with the one we have rather than the push button next to the microwave.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member for Burin—St. George's had to say. Nevertheless, I want him to know that when I decided to go into politics at the federal level, I faced even more resistance from members of my immediate family, especially my eldest son, when he came home with a copy of the *Journal de Montréal* that contained certain polling results.

People were asked to rate various professions according to the degree of confidence they had in these professions. Unfortunately for me and for all here present, we ranked 27 out of 28, just ahead of used-car dealers. So my son told me: "Dad, if you go into politics, if you are ever elected, I am afraid you will become a—", and I will let you fill in the word my 22-year old son used.

If I am not mistaken, the hon. member for Burin—St. George's voted against the motion moved by the hon. member for Richelieu—if I am wrong, I am sure he will say so—since the major problem for politicians is money. Remember what happened to Pearson airport in Toronto. The Bloc Québécois forced a major debate on the issue in this House, and it is not over yet. The matter is still before the Senate.

So wherever money is concerned, people often tend to cheat. The Bloc Québécois, through the hon. member for Richelieu, presented a motion in the House proposing that, like the system in the Quebec legislature, party fundraising would be a very democratic process, in which only individual voters would be able to donate funds to political parties. So "Power steering" Seagram and the banks would not be able to donate a single penny to political parties. And making fun of this very common sense approach suggested by the hon. member for Richelieu, a Liberal backbencher moved that no voter be allowed to donate more than one dollar, and government members voted in favour of that.

(1330)

When the hon. member for Burin—St. George's said parliamentary immunity should be maintained and that his constituents voted for him because of his qualifications—he had some faults but they were negligible—he never mentioned the need for above-board fundraising. I think it is nice to visit our constituents and ask them for financial support so that we can continue our work. And then when they put a hand on our shoulder and say: "Chrétien, you are doing a good job, keep up the good work and here is \$25", that is encouraging. I would

### *Government Orders*

rather get \$25 from one of my constituents than \$25,000 from the Royal Bank of Canada, which would make me totally dependent on the bank.

In this House I am a free man, and when I feel like criticizing, I go right ahead and do it.

So I would ask the hon. member for Burin—St. George's what he would suggest in the way of no strings attached fundraising to his colleagues in caucus. You know, when a party is in power, it may develop some very good ideas, as the Parti Québécois did, but often they are put on the backburner.

**Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can identify with the comments of my colleague for Frontenac about the survey on the level of people's trust in politicians. At the same time, however, I believe that the impressions were created by the politicians themselves. This morning, in the House, for example, we heard comments and allegations about politicians' reputations.

[*English*]

If we as politicians spend all our time telling the public what a terrible bunch of people we are, we should not be surprised if they begin believing us. We can only change that by example.

In my last election campaign the largest contribution I received from anybody was \$1,000. I have refused large amounts of money over the years for leadership campaigns. I refused a \$15,000 contribution on one occasion for a leadership campaign, and that refusal I have documented if members would like to see it.

I believe, as the member does, that if persons and companies give you large sums of money it is not because they like you, it is because they would like to rent you. I do not think we should be in that business.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before we go on, I must inform the House that the motion of the hon. member for La Prairie is admissible.

We will therefore now continue the debate on the amendment to the motion with the hon. member for Chicoutimi.

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having allowed the motion of my colleague for La Prairie. The Bloc Québécois will support the motion.

For as long as the members opposite have been in power, Canadians and Quebecers alike have helplessly watched as political scandals teeming with conflicts of interest have unfolded with every passing week and month right before our eyes, without the government, currently sitting on its majority, revealing any pangs of conscience.

*Government Orders*

By stating on the weekend in Trois-Rivières that he had succeeded in restoring honesty and integrity in Ottawa, after only 18 months in power, the Prime Minister simply added fuel to the fire. Did he not have to defend his own actions last week? Did he not come to the defence of his Minister of Canadian Heritage, who, for the second time in recent months, found himself in a conflict of interest situation by attending a dinner given by an American film giant? Integrity and honesty here border on scandal.

(1335)

I would like, if I may, to refer to the red book, which the Liberals were forever brandishing about during the last election campaign. I note in passing, however, that we hear less and less about it, since the government is unable to deliver the goods, that is, jobs. This government deserves its title of government of unemployment and poverty. The red book refers to integrity in chapter 6, on page 90, in the following terms:

The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable. If government is to play a positive role in society, as it must, honesty and integrity in our political institutions must be restored—

A little further on, at page 91, we have the following:

If government is to play a positive role in society, as it must, honesty and integrity in our political institutions must be restored.

Once again, this is wishful thinking, but it is no longer enough these days.

Let us be realistic about these things. Conflicts of interest are not new, they have always been with us. However, in recent years, such conflicts involving those in public office have caused a lot of concern in the public. Not surprising, then, that the public gives politicians the lowest approval rating.

Clearly, even the slightest hint of a conflict of interest causes the public to lose confidence in the integrity of public office holders. Need I even mention the cavalier and scandalous behaviour of certain ministers and of those working closest with them, most often relatives, which has made the need for this code of conduct greater now than ever before.

The code of conduct we are demanding would distinguish between MPs, Cabinet members and their staffs. The Bloc Québécois is against creating a joint committee of senators and MPs. In our opinion, only the elected should be able to deliberate on this issue. Members of the other place do not represent the population and, hence, cannot take part in decisions which are the sole responsibility of those who must answer to the electorate. Furthermore, their reputation has been more than tainted recently, by their own actions, behaviour, words and the high-budget foreign trips which some members of the other place have taken. I will not name any names. And, in reality, the issue

that interests us is ethics in Parliament, so, let us directly address it.

According to Mr. Justice Parker, who presided over the inquiry into the alleged conflict of interest in the case of the hon. Sinclair Stevens a few years ago, there are several kinds of conflicts of interest. For example, a real conflict of interest occurs when a minister is aware that a personal financial interest is great enough to influence the exercise of his or her official functions and responsibilities. This definition should be noted.

In addition, according to Mr. Justice Parker, a potential conflict of interest always exists when a minister ends up in a situation in which a personal financial interest could influence the exercise of official functions and responsibilities which were not yet exercised. A potential conflict of interest becomes a real conflict when the minister does not dispose of the holdings in question or does not resign from public office. These are the issues which the committee should be examining.

Mr. Justice Parker also stated that an apparent conflict of interest occurs when a reasonably well informed person has a reasonable doubt that a conflict of interest exists. This happens almost daily in this House.

(1340)

Impartiality and integrity underlie any conflict of interest rules. Decision-makers cannot be regarded as impartial and upright if they benefit or might benefit personally from their decisions. The members opposite have learned this the hard way.

Government's actions over the past 18 months have seriously shaken public confidence in government institutions. We need a code of conduct to restore public confidence and improve the government's image, especially as certain types of conflict of interest are unavoidable. This is the case of inherent conflicts of interest, which are due to the fact that parliamentarians are also members of society, and as such are either landlords, parents or consumers.

Also, there are unavoidable sources of conflict because parliamentarians represent constituents with whom they share common private interests, be it farming, fishing or natural resources development.

Family business raise a particular issue as this category generally covers a whole array of assets, debts and financial interests. It is usually at such interests that the conflict of interest legislation is aimed as they may have a significant impact on the independence of lawmakers.

The most common interests that may put lawmakers in a conflict of interest situation are the following. First of all, investments; then, debts which can be a source of conflict; also,

*Government Orders*

as managers, they must act in the best interests of their companies, whereas, as members of Parliament, they have an obligation to the public; offices held in companies may be a source of conflict.

Another potential source of conflict is other positions or professional activities. Let me give you a definition. To what extent should parliamentarians be allowed to practise law, act as consultants or hold any other kind of position? A lawmaker might attract more clients if they believed the lawmaker could increase their influence on the federal government.

There is also lobbying. It is absolutely normal for legislators to deal with government officials on behalf of their constituents, but what about MPs who take advantage of their positions to promote their own interests, or one who is paid to act for a third party? Conflicts of interest can also arise, in the case of government contracts. To what extent should members of Parliament have the right to own shares in companies that get government contracts?

Gifts and fees are another element. Should a member of Parliament be authorized to accept free trips, vacations and other gifts from acquaintances or foreign governments? Can fees be considered as gifts in disguise?

Information obtained in the performance of one's official duties can also cause conflicts of interest. Must we implement control measures to prevent legislators from using such information for personal purposes?

Finally, what about spouses and children? To what extent should the interests mentioned earlier be controlled if they belong to relatives of a member of Parliament? This is no small issue. MPs could be influenced just as much by interests owned by their families as by their own. Out of politeness, I will not insist on that point; it would simply be too easy to do so.

As you know, all of us here are governed by statutory and parliamentary rules. However, there are some contradictions in the legislation. It prevents some public office holders from being candidates but does not prevent members of Parliament from accepting those same offices once they have been elected.

(1345)

Another example comes from the fact that the Parliament of Canada Act states that a person cannot be elected to the House of Commons if he or she holds a government contract providing for the expenditure of public moneys. However if a member of Parliament does not receive public money, but benefits otherwise from such a contract, he probably will not fall under this provision, but that is far from being clear, and this is the part that hurts the most. That is far from being clear.

Finally, a parliamentarian who is a shareholder in any company having a contract with the government is covered by this provision only when the contract is for the building of public works, which seems to allow the parliamentarian to invest in a

company and thus avoid this requirement, which, you will agree, constitutes a huge loophole.

In 1973, the federal government released a green book entitled: "Members of Parliament and conflict of interest". In 1978, once again, the government moved the bill on the independence of Parliament, which would have expanded the measures proposed in the green book. In 1979, after its second reading, the bill died on the Order Paper. In November 1985, the House Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services was to examine the appropriateness of establishing a register of members' interests. Four bills aimed at governing federal legislator conflicts of interest were tabled during the 33th and 34th Parliaments.

In 1991, it went on. The government tabled its third bill on conflicts of interest, Bill C-43. In 1992, the Special Joint Committee on Conflict of Interest tabled its report. The committee members' views differed in many respects from the policies reflected in Bill C-43. In March 1993, the government tabled its fourth bill on the same subject, Bill C-116, and again, in June 1993, the Speaker of the House of Commons reported to the House, recommending that Bill C-116 be put aside. And in 1993, once again, the Liberal government stated that ethics was a significant part of its mandate. It still has not done anything.

This is of great importance since we know that in the last 20 years, millions of dollars were spent on consideration of these bills, on the establishment of parliamentary commissions or joint committees on conflicts of interest, or on the development of ethics codes for members of Parliament. Yes, millions and millions of dollars were taken from the pockets of taxpayers from Canada and Quebec. This has to stop. I want action on this, once and for all. We must stop fooling the people and act on the problem.

Government leaders must do everything they can to change the public's perception of parliamentarians. They must stop all this protecting each other, stop trying to dazzle us with all this fancy footwork to cover things up, and simply be ready to admit that some government member is in conflict of interest. It is often said, and rightly so, that it is up to leaders to set a good example. That is why I support the amendment of my colleague for La Prairie.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I found the remarks we just heard from the hon. member opposite very disappointing. He has made assertions without giving any proof, and he has stated things that, to remain within the bounds of courtesy and parliamentary language, I would describe as rather far removed from the truth.

(1350)

An hon. member said that bills introduced in the House have cost millions of dollars in tax money. Taking a bill and printing it in a subsequent session under a new number—one does not need to be a great expert in parliamentary procedure to realize that it is easy to renumber a bill and reintroduce it—may be an indication of some weakness on the part of the previous



*Government Orders*

government. I would not deny that, because we all know the former government was not convinced of the need for such a bill.

Some members opposite have been Conservative members and supporters of a former prime minister. Some of them even sat on the executive of a former prime minister's riding association. They must be offended by those remarks about their former boss and mentor, Brian Mulroney.

**Mr. Sauvageau:** He was not a liar.

**Mr. Boudria:** I did not say that.

We have before us today a very good bill introduced by the present government to fulfil another promise in the red book. It will be one of the many achievements flowing from the red book. Last Friday, the House discussed Bill C-43 on lobbyists registration. Unfortunately, that debate was not completed. That is another commitment of the Liberal government, among many others. Today, we keep another promise. This time, it is about setting up a parliamentary committee to prepare a code of conduct for members of the House and members in the other place.

[English]

I want to take a moment to talk about the issue of why we need a code of conduct for both Houses, as opposed to just one.

For the life of me, I have some difficulty understanding the amendment that is now before the House, the amendment by which senators will not be subject to a conflict of interest code that will apply to MPs. Why not? Why do some members across the way not want senators to have to live with the conflict of interest rules like we do? What is the objective of that?

[Translation]

The reasoning put forward by the mover of the amendment is more or less the following: since only members of Parliament are elected, they should be the only ones subjected to these rules. There is something wrong with that logic. Electors put pressure on their members of Parliament to remain honest; all of us feel this pressure and need it; this is what democracy is all about. If even with such democratic pressure, we still need a conflict of interest code, I think that a chamber not under this kind of pressure needs such a code at least as much as us and maybe even more. Yet, the Bloc members want to see to it that senators are not subject to conflict of interest legislation.

**Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac):** They are honest.

**Mr. Boudria:** I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how can one explain such reasoning. The member opposite just said that senators are honest. I believe that parliamentarians in both chambers are all basically honest and that all of us who have been sent here by the

Canadian people have an interest in doing what is best for our electors.

[English]

The member who spoke before me made certain accusations and he referred to the powers at the top and the family of those at the top. It was quite obvious that although he perhaps did not have what I would qualify as the fortitude of naming him, he wanted to describe the Prime Minister. He wanted to make—and he did, albeit in a less than totally courageous way, which he did not have the wherewithal to raise—accusations against the Prime Minister.

I want to bring to the attention of members an editorial in today's *Toronto Star*. The *Toronto Star* states: "Phoney scandal over satellite TV". This is the issue the member wanted to bring across.

(1355)

In Ottawa, the opposition parties, with an almost audible cry of "gotcha", think they finally have a winning issue, one that will stick to the Prime Minister's teflon hide. It is not gun control, deficit, social spending cutbacks or Quebec. No, it is direct-to-home satellite TV.

The Liberals overturned the CRTC decision last summer granting an effective monopoly to one company, ExpressVu, to bring satellite TV to people's homes. The commission decision, made without a public hearing, had prompted howls, not only from the competition, Power DirecTv, a subsidiary of Power Corp., but also from consumers and editorialists.

In response, the Liberals established a panel of three people of impeccable credentials, all former deputy ministers, to review the CRTC decision. They concluded that the CRTC had goofed, and called for an opening up of direct-to-home satellite TV to competition. The cabinet concurred.

The opposition complaint is not with the substance of the government's decision; rather, it is that Power Corporation's president, André Desmarais, is the Prime Minister's son-in-law.

I will read the last line as we approach question period. It states: "The cabinet's authority to overturn CRTC rulings in cases such as this was specifically envisioned by this legislation introduced by the Conservative government, of which Bouchard was a member. As for the Prime Minister's own role, he declared a conflict and stayed out of the decision." Case closed.

There have been no fewer than four such editorials. Did members across outline this? No. They continued today to make what I would qualify as less than honest comments impugning the integrity of the Prime Minister.

S. O. 31

**The Speaker:** It being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5) the House will proceed to statements by members.

Please be assured, Ms. Koudil, that despite the deplorable insensitivity some of our politicians have shown you, there is a lot of support here for the fight you have taken up.

\* \* \*

[English]

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### BALA AND DISTRICT LIONS CLUB

**Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to acknowledge a special undertaking in my riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka.

The community of Bala, which is well known for its annual Cranberry Festival, is once again proving that its citizens have what it takes to launch worthwhile community initiatives.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Bala and District Lions Club, an organization that time and time again has contributed to the positive development of this close-knit community.

Now, to commemorate its 50th anniversary, the Lions Club intends to build an open-sided community pavilion at Jaspens Park in Bala for use by families and groups who spend time enjoying the park. Fundraising has begun in earnest and a concept drawing has been prepared by local artist and historian Lorne Jewitt.

I congratulate the Bala and District Lions Club for this welcome and generous initiative. I applaud the Lions members for the warmth and spirit behind this move, because when it comes right down to it these are the gestures that truly define our communities.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, after a week-long wait, Ms. Hafsa Zinaï Koudil, an Algerian filmmaker, finally set foot in Montreal. Ms. Koudil will now be able to attend the festival “Vues d’Afrique” and present her movie “Le Démon au féminin” in which she decries the intolerance and abuses of fundamentalism in Algeria.

The Minister of Immigration initially refused to grant an entry visa to Ms. Koudil despite having approved a special visa for a right-wing American activist one week earlier. Following vigorous pressure exerted by cultural and women’s groups, supported by the official opposition, the minister finally granted the required visa.

### TAX INEQUITY

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this statement is inspired by the passionate and entirely justified complaint of Bruno Epp of Calgary.

Bruno, along with thousands and thousands of other Albertans, is fed up with decades of federal tax unfairness that has resulted in the following inequity. From 1961 to 1992 Albertans per capita and per year paid out over \$2,000 more tax to the federal government than they received in services. The only other province whose citizens got less than they paid was Ontario.

This trend will only worsen now that the finance minister decided in his last budget to disproportionately punish Alberta for its fiscal responsibility. There is a basic injustice here that is not being ignored in Alberta.

Why should the citizens of one province pay out for three decades running billions more than they received? The country has taken Alberta for granted. Bruno Epp and thousands of other Albertans want Ottawa to know they have had enough.

\* \* \*

### ONTARIO ELECTIONS

**Mr. Gar Knutson (Elgin—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish all candidates the best of luck in the upcoming provincial election. Their province and their country need them.

A Liberal government led by Lyn McLeod at Queen’s Park will help get Ontario back on track. The performance of the current NDP government, including its obstructionist, unco-operative dismissal of federal-provincial relations, has left Ontario with uncontrolled government spending, rising debt, a stalled economy and one in nine Ontarians on welfare. Clearly the time for a change in government is now.

I wish Mr. Rudy Stikl and Mr. Barry Fitzgerald, the Liberal candidates in Norfolk and Elgin, all the best. Their own communities and all Ontario need their contribution at Queen’s Park. Good luck to all Ontario Liberals.

\* \* \*

### VOLUNTEERS

**Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, April 23 to the 29 marked provincial volunteer week in Nova Scotia, and throughout my riding numerous receptions were held to honour the wonderful people who volunteer in our communities.

*S. O. 31*

There can be no dollar value placed on the selfless commitment of time and hard work by thousands of volunteers who make our communities better places to live.

Many seniors groups throughout Cumberland—Colchester have asked me to publicly thank the Ministry of Health for sponsoring the new horizons grants which help volunteers in so many communities to assist seniors projects helping seniors.

Volunteerism is alive and well. I thank the thousands of volunteers in Cumberland—Colchester who serve our communities which make Canada the number one country in which to live.

\* \* \*

**GRAND RIVER**

**Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, running through the centre of my riding is the beautiful Grand. On the shores of this heritage river is the flora associated with a rare and exotic Carolinian ecosystem.

Determined to sustain and improve our understanding of this ecosystem, the Grand Valley Trails Association applied to the federal government for support under the environmental partners fund so it could plant restorative vegetation and build pathways along the river front.

The Brantford environmental education project was approved and as a result we now have a remarkable partnership. The Brant Waterways Foundation, the Grand River Conservation Authority and the city of Brantford have all joined together to help manage this spectacular project in our community.

Last Thursday we all came together to celebrate the official opening of the pathways. They are marvellous. I congratulate the five partners in the project and invite everyone to come to Brantford to enjoy our Carolinian ecosystem along the Grand River.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**WORKERS' RIGHTS**

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I attended a celebration marking International Workers Day yesterday, in Granby. A representative of the former workers of the Simonds plant reminded me of our collective responsibility to defend workers' rights.

Simonds, a Granby tool manufacturing company which has now closed down, took over its employees' pension plan. Since 1988, Simonds' ex-employees have been pleading in court to recover the surplus from their pension plan. Last week, the company decided to challenge the unanimous Appeal Court decision to distribute the surplus among the workers.

It is time to expose this kind of fraud. We have a duty to let companies know that they have to fulfil their moral and legal responsibilities towards their employees.

\* \* \*

[English]

**WEST COAST FISHERIES**

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has been hailed as the hero of the east coast. At the other end of the country the B.C. fishery has taken a beating and, according to British Columbia's fisheries minister, 1995 will be no different.

Along the Quesnel River the chinook salmon run of 1994 was down 75 per cent. The Quesnel River hatchery released over 200,000 fish to support these levels but it is threatened with imminent closure.

Its last release scheduled for this month will consist of 200,000 one-gram chinook babies who only have a one in one-thousand chance of surviving because of their age and size. They are being released a whole year early. These fish are not crying out, "someone reach out and save us", like the minister quoted the turbot as saying in New York. After all, these chinook are not old enough to talk.

(1405)

It is time for the minister to take his commitment to conservation seriously. It is time for him to show his commitment to protecting the chinook salmon. Preserve the salmon for our children and grandchildren by keeping this hatchery open.

\* \* \*

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the National Capital Commission has a proposed master plan for the development of a high tech park in the greenbelt area in Nepean. There already exists a high tech district in Kanata which is under utilized and ready for business.

Is it necessary to build when the infrastructure already exists? Is it necessary to destroy a green area when other areas are already serviced and desperate for business? Would more stable employment not be generated faster if the existing infrastructure were used?

Furthermore, the NCC's plans are bitterly opposed by the neighbourhood. Most residents of Crystal Bay have signed letters protesting the proposal. Earlier in March a public meeting was held and the residents clearly stated they wanted the greenbelt green, not paved.

The government repeatedly promises to be responsible and frugal in its spending. The Liberals say they are committed to

reducing the public debt and encouraging private sector growth in the areas of high technology and employment.

Therefore is it not time to shelve the NCC's master plan for a high tech park?

\* \* \*

### PHYSIOTHERAPY

**Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week was national physiotherapy week. This year also marks the Canadian Physiotherapy Association's diamond jubilee.

National physiotherapy week is an annual campaign sponsored by the Canadian Physiotherapy Association to increase awareness of physiotherapy. This year's theme was: "Physiotherapy: Celebrating the Past, Shaping the Future". The theme related to the evolving role of physiotherapists in Canada's health care system.

[Translation]

For over 75 years, physiotherapists have helped Canadians get into top physical shape. In addition to this important role, they are now increasingly involved in promoting good health.

[English]

I join Canada's 12,000 physiotherapists in reminding Canadians of the important role physiotherapists play as members of our important health care system.

\* \* \*

### FIREFIGHTERS

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, people around the world have been deeply affected by the images of the recent and terrifying bombing of an Oklahoma government building.

One of the most vivid images of this decade and the most haunting is one that we have seen on the covers of our national newspapers and magazines, that of an Oklahoma firefighter holding a young child in his arms.

In Canada, as in the United States, we are proud of our firefighters, full time and volunteer, who put their lives on the line every time they go to work. Firefighting is one of the nation's most dangerous occupations, and the men and women who enter this profession do so in service to all Canadians everywhere. They are also the largest providers of field emergency medical care for Canadians.

This week the International Association of Firefighters is holding its fourth annual legislative conference in Ottawa.

Please join me, colleagues, in welcoming firefighters from across Canada to our nation's capital. Let us also thank them for

*S. O. 31*

their courage, bravery and altruism which they so readily share with our families and neighbours. Thank you for all your hard work.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was recently saddened to learn about the death of a young boy, Iqbal Masib, who was campaigning against the use of children in Pakistani carpet factories. Although his protest campaign resulted in the closure of several factories, it also led to his death at the hands of killers.

Children are hired as factory workers in several countries not only because they have small fingers but also because they do not complain about abuse and constitute a source of cheap labour for employers. That is very, very sad.

[English]

Canada must be vocal in its denunciation of child labour in all its forms. We must convince governments with existing legislation to enforce their laws with respect to the bonding of children as labourers. Those without existing laws must be singled out and denounced. Abuse of children is unacceptable. It is barbaric and it must not be tolerated.

The children of the world must be given a chance. Canada has a responsibility to help them.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### LABOUR RELATIONS

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that workers are not in the mood to celebrate this day, May 1, with members of the federal government. For the past 18 months, the government has been considering the possibility of introducing antiscab legislation. Yet, nothing has been done and we have learned that this is no longer a priority for the labour minister. Meanwhile, the 116 Ogilvie Mills workers on strike for the past 11 months see scabs crossing the picket line every day.

(1410)

In two months, two special back-to-work bills were rammed through Parliament, ignoring the workers' right to negotiate and encouraging employers to remain inflexible.

One cannot serve Power Corporation and CN on the one hand and care about workers' needs and concerns on the other hand. The government chose between the two and it did not choose the workers.

*S. O. 31*

[English]

### ORGAN DONATION

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, organ donors and recipients held an informal meeting in Ottawa last week hosted by the Deputy Speaker. They were particularly pleased when the Speaker of the House took time to address them in person.

These men and women embody the best in human endeavour. Donations of organs are often contemplated in times of sorrow so that a fuller life will be offered to someone else.

I encourage every MP in the House to open their driver's licence and sign the universal donor card. By this altruistic act we politicians can show compassionate leadership. Organ donation can provide hope to someone quietly slipping away.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the biennial convention of the Quebec wing of the federal Liberal Party was held in Trois-Rivières last weekend. This convention allowed the federalist troops to review various issues of national importance and get ready for the referendum to be held this fall.

Those in attendance participated in some very interesting workshops and discussions. The convention was a total success.

That is why I wish to congratulate all the organizers who contributed in varying degrees to the success of this event. The welcome we received from the people of Trois-Rivières also helped make it a success.

I am sure that all the participants left the Trois-Rivières region with a feeling of accomplishment. We are more ready than ever to face the separatist forces during the referendum campaign.

\* \* \*

### NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the people in my riding of London—Middlesex are very concerned about Quebec's possible secession from Canada. Like most Canadians, they understand that Quebec is a very important member of the Canadian family.

They believe, however, that common sense will prevail in Quebec and that, faced with the choice, Quebecers will opt for a

united Canada. Despite occasional difficulties, Quebec and Canada have always been good partners.

All concerned citizens should work to preserve national unity.

\* \* \*

[English]

### GUN CONTROL

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I attended a gun owners' rally in my riding organized by the Reform Party. The two featured speakers were myself and the member for Crowfoot. Not surprisingly, I found myself on the defensive for my support of the government's gun control bill.

However, it was most interesting to hear the Reform Party member for Crowfoot state he considers ownership of a firearm to be a right, not a privilege, and that every person should be entitled to use the threat of deadly force to protect his personal possessions, for example his television or VCR.

He told people in the audience that if someone steals from them or attempts to do so they should be able to reach for their guns. This is not the view of most Canadians or most gun owners. It is a view surely only of a few, a minority. The Reform Party needs to search its conscience and listen on this issue to the majority of Canadians.

\* \* \*

### PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Pearson airport, the current hub of Canada's transportation system, is falling behind the competition in its bid to become North America's gateway to the world. Partisan politics is obscuring the main task at hand. Pearson must prepare for the 21st century and increase its capacity.

Ninety-seven Liberal MPs represent Ontario in the current government; 97 MPs whose constituents would benefit from Pearson emerging as a viable force on the international scene. Yet no solution to the current log jam is in sight.

(1415)

Why is the government delaying the inevitable? Let us hold an impartial judicial inquiry into the contracting process with a specific deadline. If evidence of wrongdoing is found let us move to punish those responsible. If no evidence of wrongdoing is found let us renew, renegotiate or re-tender the contract.

This is no rocket science but the old saying about safety in numbers obviously does not apply to Ontario's voice in Ottawa.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[Translation]***SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in his speech to the Liberal party faithful in Trois-Rivières yesterday, the Prime Minister accused the Government of Quebec of ignoring poverty, adding that Quebec had more poor people than anywhere else in Canada.

My question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister, and I imagine it will be the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Would the minister agree that it takes a lot of nerve to accuse the Government of Quebec of neglecting the poor, when his own government, in its first two budgets, launched an attack on the poor and the disadvantaged in Quebec and Canada, thus putting thousands of people on welfare?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly share the public's concern about poverty, and especially child poverty.

However, our government has taken a number of steps to respond to these serious problems. For instance, we created thousands of jobs across Canada, and especially in Quebec, where we created 110,000 permanent jobs, including 73,000 in Montreal alone during the past year.

The best way to deal with poverty is to help people get a job. This year, the government's record on job creation has certainly been the best of any western country.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, 40 per cent of new welfare recipients in Quebec are unemployed workers who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. Who is to blame? Blame the man who launched those tirades on the weekend.

How can the federal government accuse the Government of Quebec of ignoring poverty, when the federal government, through cuts in unemployment insurance under Bill C-17 and reductions in federal transfer payments for social assistance, has aggravated the circumstances of thousands of people who, in Quebec, are already living below the poverty line?

*[English]*

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out two very important figures. During the past year 86,000 fewer people applied for unemployment insurance as a direct consequence of

improved job creation and employment development. In other words, the number of people applying for unemployment insurance has fallen drastically. The number of people who have exhausted their benefits has fallen by almost 25 per cent.

To say, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition tried to do in his statement yesterday, that the consequence of the problem is because of people exhausting UI benefits is simply not borne out by the facts.

We understand and certainly share a very strong concern about long term unemployment problems. They are faced by every country. There are major changes in the workplace. That is why we want to bring in reforms to our social, training and development programs. To go around pointing the finger, as the hon. member did, and saying that is the problem simply is not borne out by the reality of the facts.

(1420)

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, job creation is the best way to fight poverty.

That being the case, the federal government is hardly in a position to blame Quebec, when that same government refuses to get involved in the conversion of Quebec's defence industry, refuses to help MIL Davie, cuts off regional development assistance and manages to chop \$200 million from the infrastructures program, the only tangible job creation measure announced by this government since it came to power.

*[English]*

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have been through the discussion on MIL Davie. My colleague, the Minister of Industry, has dealt with it many times, pointing out that the major shareholder in MIL Davie is the Government of Quebec. If they are directly concerned about job creation then they have an opportunity to produce.

I point out a further observation for the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Because of the direct efforts and initiative of the government, in addition to setting a different climate throughout the country for the 430,000 jobs that have been created, over 120,000 jobs were created last year. There were infrastructure, new programs in internships and new developments dealing with applied programs for apprenticeships. Various kinds of direct initiatives have provided an additional 120,000 jobs for Canadians.

That demonstrates we are taking our responsibilities seriously. We are doing what we can to respond. We simply ask that other governments take their responsibilities as well.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry stated last Friday in the House that he had kept the Prime Minister's senior policy adviser, Eddie Goldenberg, abreast of developments on the Power DirecTv file, in which the rather large Liberal family, including the Prime Minister's son-in-law, has a stake.

My question is for the Minister of Industry. How can he claim that the Prime Minister remained at arm's length of the Power DirecTv issue, which has implications for his son-in-law, when his senior policy adviser was kept apprised of developments and intervened at every step of the process, until it culminated in the adoption of an order custom-made for Power DirecTv?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I explained in detail Thursday and Friday, I believe, the satellite broadcasting issue was handled transparently and was accepted by all independent parties concerned. I have yet to hear how the Bloc Québécois would handle the satellite broadcasting issue, perhaps because they lack a policy on it. Our approach was to table a directive in the House of Commons, as provided for under the Broadcasting Act, which was tabled in the House when the leader of the Bloc Québécois was a member of the Mulroney Cabinet.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, what gall! When the minister talks about transparency on this issue, the only thing that is clear is that the Prime Minister's son-in-law lucked out when this extraordinary, unprecedented, exceptional measure was implemented. That is the one thing that is clear.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. member:** That is what I call clear. That is transparent.

**An hon. member:** That is family spirit.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Can the Minister of Industry actually be serious when he claims that Mr. Goldenberg was not involved in the Power DirecTv deal, when Cabinet made its first move in the company's favour, deciding to review the CRTC's order and to create a working group led by Mr. Goldenberg's former associate just days after the Prime Minister's senior policy adviser and the president of Power DirecTv met?

[English]

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the report of the committee speaks for itself. The committee proceeded in a transparent fashion. It received submissions from across Canada. It made them available public-

ly. The report of the committee has not been criticized in its logic or its substance by any member of the House, including the hon. member who posed the question.

There is no basis upon which the government should fail to act to carry out its responsibilities in a way that responds to the interests of consumers and ensures a competitive structure for satellite broadcasting in Canada.

(1425 )

If there is any basis upon which the hon. member can suggest the government should not act or should refuse to act in the best interest of Canadians, let him explain it. He has the opportunity to do that during the course of review of the direction in the House of Commons.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, throughout the direct to home satellite debate the government has attempted to deflect criticism by portraying the Reform Party as anti-competition, and nothing could be further from the truth.

The government has also said that we could not criticize the process. Wrong again. Not one part of the tainted DTH process was above board. Expressvu is loaded with CRTC insiders and Power DirecTv has stronger Liberal ties than Mackenzie King.

The only thing that has been clear in all of it is that Canadians are paying the price for the government's lack of coherent cultural policy that favours true competition.

My question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage. If the government truly wants competition, why will it not live up to its commitment to release a comprehensive cultural policy?

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are making policy and this is what seems to be so irritating to the opposition. It is important to make policy for the information highway and the bottom line of it is Canadian content. The bottom line of Canadian content is the production of Canadian content. This is what we are doing.

We are bringing the policy before the House through the direction. There will be opportunity for members of both opposition parties to express their views. This is also the reason why I have been investing time in the film industry, in order to make sure there is Canadian content.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I did not get a response to my question regarding competition. Policy is required but not the ad hoc weathervane approach of the government.

One day the government is restricting choice and competition in the country music industry. The next day it is opening the doors for its Liberal friends in Power Corp and their American buddies to set up their satellite networks across the country. It is

*Oral Questions*

no wonder the Minister of Canadian Heritage does not know whether he is coming or going.

I have a supplementary question. Where does the government really stand on competition in cultural industries? Is the government for it or against it?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is very important to understand one thing. In pursuing the issue of how to move forward the satellite broadcasting file, the government has repeatedly restated its commitment to a competitive environment.

I do not understand. Last Thursday quite properly Mr. Rick Anderson disclosed on national television that he had an interest in Expressvu. I would like to know, and I think Canadians have a right to know, whether the senior political adviser for the leader of the Reform Party has played a role in deciding what strategy members of that party were going to follow in pursuing this file because they are against competition and they are against consumers in the way they are conducting this file.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that is the most ridiculous spin I have heard yet in the House of Commons.

My question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage. The government's ad hoc approach to cultural competition cannot continue. Eventually the Liberals will have to get off the fence. The CBC is in disarray for the lack of a cultural policy. The Canada Council is in disarray for the lack of a cultural policy. We are crawling along the information highway at a snail's pace because of the lack of cultural policy.

What is the holdup? Is the government waiting for the approval of Mr. Goldenberg, Mr. Desmarais or Mr. Bronfman?

I ask again: When will the government release its long awaited cultural policy? We have been waiting for 18 months.

(1430)

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, before asking about Canadian cultural policy, our colleague should know about Canadian culture.

The hon. member seems to have been fighting to bring American culture here by supporting some American interest in the Country Music Network rather than supporting Canadian interests. It is no wonder that through a lot of accusations which have nothing to do with policy she gets a wonderful quote in the *Globe and Mail*. The Saturday editorial in the *Globe and Mail* said: "The public has a pretty good nose for a rat and this time it is not on government benches".

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Minister of Industry acknowledged that Eddie Gol-

denberg, the Prime Minister's senior adviser, had communicated two things to him, and I quote: "—that the Prime Minister did not want to be involved in any way in the matter, and neither did he". Not long before, however, the Minister of Industry had said he had kept Mr. Goldenberg informed of all developments concerning Power DirecTv.

How does the Prime Minister explain the Minister of Industry's regularly informing his senior adviser, Eddie Goldenberg, of decisions concerning Power DirecTv, after Mr. Goldenberg had said he did not want to be involved in the matter in any way?

[English]

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I find it peculiar that opposition members seem to think there is something wrong here when they cannot point to anything wrong either with the report or its implementation.

I will restate that of course it is normal in important files that the Prime Minister's office would be informed of what was happening. However, I would also like to state as I have repeatedly that with respect to this file decisions were taken by the Minister of Canadian Heritage and myself. We were neither instructed nor requested either by the Prime Minister or by his principal secretary to do anything in particular on these files. The decisions we took were our own. As far as I am concerned, I have yet to hear any substantive criticism of any of them.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the direct involvement of the Prime Minister's son-in-law, in view of the millions of dollars at stake and in view of the serious allegations as to the role of the Prime Minister's office in the Power DirecTv matter, will the Prime Minister agree to table in this House the memorandum in which he insisted he not be involved in this matter in order to avoid any conflict of interest given his son-in-law's interests in Power DirecTv?

[English]

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this same question was put on Friday. There is no question of something being tabled. The Prime Minister made it clear in his only comment on this file in my hearing that he wanted nothing to do with it. He removed himself from cabinet when it was discussed at that time. There is really nothing there for the hon. member to ask for.

It is more important to ask what exactly this is all about. I think that is a complete bankruptcy of policy in both of the opposition parties, neither of which has the faintest idea what should be done with respect to satellite broadcasting policy in this country.



## Oral Questions

## MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT PENSIONS

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this government appears particularly sneaky. First it told Canadians that MP pension reform would save taxpayers over \$3 million. It did not mention the fact that Canadian taxpayers would have to top up the trough annually to the tune of \$7 million.

The government told Reformers that we could opt out if we found the pension scheme a little too rich for our blood. What it did not say was that future MPs will be forced to join this obscene pension plan.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Why has the government limited the opting out provision to current MPs only? How deep is this cabinet's commitment to real pension reform?

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it was on February 22 that the President of the Treasury Board made the announcement with respect to MP pensions. A backgrounder was also available on that day indicating very clearly the conditions under which the legislation would come forth. It is an opportunity for people to opt in once the legislation is in. Everybody will be treated in a very similar way.

(1435)

I might add that the member for Calgary West and the leader of the Reform Party were in attendance at the meeting. I do not know why there are any particular surprises. If there are suggestions to be made, they can be made in this House when the legislation is debated. They can also be made in committee.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my surprise stems from the fact that this government had the gall to actually introduce that legislation without making some kind of statement.

Nothing has really changed. The MP pension plan is still astronomically rich. We will still receive twice the national limit. Those benefits are still indexed against inflation and there is no cap on ministerial pensions.

Maybe the class of 1988 and the others who will choose to join me in opting out of this pension plan could change things from the inside. The legislation that was tabled is not acceptable.

Why did the government rule out replacing the entire MP pension scheme with a more realistic private plan such as other Canadians receive, one dollar for one dollar?

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this particular question shows very clearly the opportunism sought by the Reform Party. The red book made two promises. It said that the age of eligibility would be raised and that has been done. The red

book also said there would be no double dipping and that has also been done.

However, the government decided to go further. It said that it would contribute one-third less to MP pensions than it had in the past. It also said that MPs did not need to participate. It also said there would be 20 per cent less accrual rate for MPs. It went beyond what was promised. The Reform Party is trying to exploit this issue for its advantage.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## SEAGRAM

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the heritage minister claims that he learned of the takeover of MCA by Seagram only after getting off the plane in Los Angeles, adding that the transaction was highly secretive, when there had been reports about the imminent takeover of MCA by Seagram for weeks.

How can the Minister of Canadian Heritage explain his travelling incognito to Los Angeles accompanied only by his chief of staff, without being given the usual pre-trip briefing that department officials always give their ministers before a trip abroad?

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, such trips, this one in particular, are carefully planned. As I told the House before, I had taken the time to consult with several representatives of the Canadian film industry. That qualifies as preparation.

Second, to keep travel expenses to a minimum, I do not travel abroad with an entourage of government officials unless I have to, and I dare anyone to come out and disprove it. I would also point out to our colleagues opposite that the our consul general in Los Angeles was with me at every meeting I attended. So, every single one of the allegations we have heard over the past few days is false.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister maintains that this visit had been carefully organized. If that is the case, could he tell us how he can continue to maintain in earnest that he knew nothing about this transaction until he got off the plane in Los Angeles, when every major daily newspaper in Canada was reporting that a deal was imminent, as was confirmed by Mr. Bronfman himself the day before the minister arrived incognito in Los Angeles?

(1440)

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, not surprisingly, our colleague is not listening to me. Of course, rumours had been going around for a few days and I am on record in *Hansard* as saying on April 28 that I had heard a rumour to that effect a couple of days prior to the takeover.

*Oral Questions*

So, the hon. member's story shows not only that he does not listen but that he does not read *Hansard*. Only a wizard could have predicted exactly when the transaction would take place. In order to know, I would have had to be informed of what was going on. I did not learn about the transaction on the day it took place because, as I have been telling you repeatedly, no one kept me fully informed of this whole matter.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HARBOURFRONT**

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

When the finance minister brought down his budget in February he said that all Canadians and regions would share the pain equally, every region except metro Toronto apparently. Canadians were stunned to hear that under pressure from Liberal MPs, the federal government is restoring \$4 million of federal funding to Harbourfront.

How can the Prime Minister justify giving Harbourfront \$4 million at a time when Canadians are being asked to tighten their belts even further?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Reform Party has raised this issue. It underlines its fundamental support for cultural activities in this country.

I am rather surprised that Reform members would be against Harbourfront receiving moneys in order that it can carry on its activities and contribute substantially to tourism in the province of Ontario.

The hon. member should also know that the money which has been allotted to Harbourfront is not new money. It is a reallocation of moneys from the existing department, which goes a long way to providing much needed jobs in the city of Toronto.

\* \* \*

**WINNIPEG JETS**

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, obviously there is no overall plan.

As if Harbourfront were not bad enough, now we learn that the Minister of Human Resources Development will be meeting with the Prime Minister today to secure a \$16 million loan for the Winnipeg Jets. If the minister thinks that the taxpayers will stand for this kind of expenditure, he has been playing without his helmet for too long.

Will the Prime Minister assure this House that no public money will be used to prop up the Winnipeg Jets?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. member demonstrates how weak a case can be gained by the Reform Party using the somewhat flimsy source of resources that are provided by the media from time to time.

All we can report to members is that whatever initiative is taken in terms of the Winnipeg Jets and the arena is being initiated by the private sector in that city. Applications for grants have been made under the infrastructure program, as several other cities have already done. That is the kind of proposal that would be considered, if requested.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BOSNIA**

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The truce in Bosnia officially expires today, May 1. Yesterday, the UN special envoy in the former Yugoslavia, Mr. Akashi, failed in an ultimate attempt to extend the truce, following the refusal of Bosnian Serb belligerents.

Can the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell us about the current situation in Bosnia with the expiration of the truce and does he agree that fighting could intensify in the next few days and jeopardize the safety of Canadian peacekeepers?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for giving me this opportunity to say, on behalf of the Canadian government, that we support the efforts of the UN envoy, Mr. Akashi.

The developments which occurred over the last few hours give us reason to believe that, although the truce will not be extended, fighting will not intensify. We, of course, made representations to the parties involved in the conflict, asking them to use some elementary restraint so that the situation does not deteriorate any further.

(1445)

The position of UN peacekeeping forces is such that they can save lives among the population affected by the conflict. This is why Canada continues to support the UN's efforts to restore peace.

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell us if the UN made new representations to the Bosnian government and to Bosnian Serbs to ensure the following: first, an extension of the truce; second, the maintenance of the humanitarian assistance provided; and

*Oral Questions*

third, the pursuit of the negotiation process between the belligerents? Are there any new agreements?

[English]

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the three points is yes.

I know that some members of the Reform Party were not too happy because I was trying to give as elaborate an answer as possible. The situation in ex-Yugoslavia is extremely serious. I do not know if they feel we should not be participating in trying to maintain peace and security in Europe. However, it certainly is important and I commend the hon. member for raising a question of such importance in the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES**

**Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

As all Canadians are aware, and I am very proud to say, Canada has been successful in negotiating a settlement with the European Union with regard to the recent dispute over Greenland halibut. It is a settlement which will ensure conservation of fragile fish stocks as well as strict enforcement of NAFO fishing regulations.

Can the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans inform the House what the government is doing to ensure implementation of the terms of this agreement?

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for St. John's West for her question.

I am pleased to inform all members of the House, especially my friends in the Reform Party who are waiting with bated breath, no pun intended, that 35 European Union observers will be arriving in St. John's, Newfoundland today and tomorrow. The EU observers will be taken aboard EU support vessels and by Friday placed on all Spanish and Portuguese vessels fishing within the NAFO regulation zone.

\* \* \*

**BOSNIA AND CROATIA**

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that we are very interested in what is happening in the former Yugoslavia. As we are deploying troops in Bosnia and Croatia, UN troops are being blockaded in their barracks and their positions are being mined.

In Croatia a new military offensive has begun and several UN soldiers have been wounded.

With the situation deteriorating, just as the Reform Party predicted, when will the government finally realize that it should pull our troops out of Bosnia and Croatia?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we know it is a very dangerous situation in the former Yugoslavia. Canadian soldiers are making a heroic effort to continue to discharge their mission.

With respect to the question of the mandate, that was debated in the House some weeks ago. We re-engaged for a further six months and nothing has caused the Government to Canada to change its mind since that time.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we all know that the government would pull out of Bosnia and Croatia if the whole UN contingent was withdrawn.

Are there any cases, and what would those specific conditions be, in which we might take unilateral action to pull our troops out?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has made it known a number of times, as well as all of us in the government, that if the arms embargo was lifted it would precipitate Canada to take its soldiers out of ex-Yugoslavia.

In principle, we do not favour doing anything unilaterally. We are working with our allies on the ground. A concerted effort will be made to deal with all the problems there. Should those forces have to leave, it will be done in co-operation with those with whom we are serving.

\* \* \*

(1450)

[Translation]

**LABOUR RELATIONS**

**Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. At the Liberal convention in Trois-Rivières last weekend, the Minister of Labour said that including antiscab provisions in the Canada Labour Code was no longer a priority for the government. The minister has clearly chosen to devote herself full time to the Quebec referendum, thus neglecting her responsibilities as federal Minister of Labour.

How does the minister justify the about-face of his colleague, the Minister of Labour, who now refuses to table a bill that would add antiscab provisions to the Canada Labour Code after promising to do so upon taking office?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, consultations on this issue are under way between the Minister of Labour, the unions and the employers. At the minister's request, the Director General of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is meeting with the parties. We

are not yet in a position to answer this question. We will give the hon. member an answer as soon as it becomes available.

**Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ):** How can the minister justify the fact that his colleague, the Minister of Labour, who was so eager to bludgeon rail workers upon taking office, no longer finds the time to include antiscab provisions in the Canada Labour Code?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, just as we did during the rail strikes, we acted in the national interest. We also think that we must now take the time to consult with the parties and try to reach a compromise.

I know that the opposition would prefer to take immediate action, without taking all necessary measures and without analyzing the situation. This government, however, wants to do the right thing for Canadians and Quebecers and will therefore make every effort required to achieve this goal.

\* \* \*

[English]

## HIGHWAYS

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, last Monday we were advised that the province of Nova Scotia, not the federal government, had decided to divert \$26 million from the Wentworth bypass project in Nova Scotia to the riding of the minister of public works in Cape Breton.

Richie Mann, an MLA in Cape Breton whose riding will also benefit from this diversion of funds has stated: "Mr. Dingwall's role in this is that he talked to us about it and we talked to him about it and we all agreed it is a worthwhile project to do".

My question is for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services. Why did the minister put himself in a conflict of interest position when he talked to Mr. Mann about diverting the \$26 million to a tourist road in his riding from a road that has claimed over 40 lives between 1986 and 1992, a road that will now have to be a toll road?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual situation when members of Parliament, and for that matter because of a previous incarnation when I was in the New Brunswick legislature, not to have politicians talk about roads, especially in Atlantic Canada.

I can assure the hon. member that the discussion of the allocation of highway funds for Nova Scotia took place with the minister of transport for Nova Scotia. Those consultations are ongoing with Nova Scotia and other provinces.

## Oral Questions

I am sure the hon. member recognizes that when members of the House have an opportunity to discuss with their provincial colleagues matters of mutual interest, it is certainly not a matter of conflict of interest, but a matter of doing their jobs. It is something of which the hon. member is not too aware, obviously, by the interest he has brought to this matter over the last couple of weeks.

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time I have stood in the House and asked the question of the minister of public works, and I keep getting an answer from this fellow.

Members on both sides of the House say misappropriation of funds has taken place. This is a classic case of conflict of interest. The Auditor General of Nova Scotia says that this is a serious case.

Will the Prime Minister call for an investigation by the ethics counsellor? If possible, I would like to ask either the Prime Minister to answer or the fellow who will not stand up here.

(1455)

**The Speaker:** Usually, but not always, questions should be directed to a minister rather than this fellow because it confuses the Chair sometimes. The hon. Minister of Transport.

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that the hon. member does not understand that when agreements are made with provinces there is an ongoing process of consultation.

The moneys that are going to be spent in Nova Scotia, as is the case with any other funds expended on behalf of the Canadian taxpayers, are subject to very stringent review both by the Auditor General of Canada as well as our department when we are reviewing those expenditures.

I know the hon. member is new to the House. It is true he has been up three or four times—and it shows—but the problem he has is in addressing questions like this using words like misappropriation of funds. If the hon. member were a little bit more careful he would understand that misappropriation of funds has implications that go far beyond a simple renegotiation of a contract to allocate funds for highway construction in any province.

Therefore, I ask the hon. member to reconsider that kind of insinuation.

\* \* \*

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board.

*Oral Questions*

My colleague is familiar with recent reports from the Commissioner of Official Languages. Those reports single out problems that some Canadians are having in getting service in the two official languages from federal offices.

Could the parliamentary secretary tell the House what the government is doing to get at these problems to ensure that Canadians receive federal services in either official language where that is entitled?

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the commitment and the resolve to ensure quality services in federal buildings under the Official Languages Act continues.

The Secretary of the Treasury Board will be requesting action plans from all of those departments where performance was weak or where they were not investigated. Those plans will be brought forward by the end of September, will be put together and brought to the parliamentary committee on official languages for discussion. The degree to which the implementation has occurred will be reviewed in March 1996 and every six months thereafter.

Finally, a list of all of the buildings requiring those services have been updated and circulated. There have been over 700 consultations in the regions to try to ensure that the service is improved.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**VOLUNTEER WORK**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

The minister recently published a brochure promoting National Volunteer Week. This brochure emphasizes the importance of volunteer work in our communities and pays tribute to the 13 million volunteers in Quebec and Canada who give their time to the disadvantaged, the needy and the neglected.

How can the minister stress the merits of and need for volunteer work when the funds allotted to voluntary organizations have fallen from \$1,066,000 in 1993-94 to \$65,000 in 1995-96, a 94 per cent cut?

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have yet to announce the amounts that will go to volunteer organizations. I support their work because it is eminently commendable and because it furthers the development of Canadian society.

[English]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a recently published study on the economics of immigration has confirmed that the Reform Party has been right all along. It found, among other things, that the skill and language levels and ability to integrate of today's immigrants has declined as a result of the short-sighted family reunification and refugee policies of the government.

In light of this study, will the minister of immigration immediately reconsider his 1995-96 do nothing immigration plan, a plan that makes no significant changes to the policies of the last decade?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the levels document we presented to the House of Commons was not only the work of the caucus and the government. For the first time we reached out, talked and discussed with over 10,000 Canadians the kind of immigration policy that the country wants to have and what were their views on our position in the international community. The answer is, no, we will not reconsider.

\* \* \*

(1500)

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Recently the government announced the total elimination of funding for global education groups and youth organizations, from the Queen Charlotte Islands Global Link Society in B.C. to the St. John's Oxfam office in Newfoundland, as well as the total elimination of \$8 million for the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

I want to ask the minister this question: In view of the government's earlier promises in the foreign policy statement and in Cairo to strengthen these programs, will the government now reconsider this slashing? And will it explain why it has abandoned the promises it made to the people of Canada and to the poor women of the world?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure the hon. member that indeed we are not abandoning our commitment. We are going to do it differently. We will privilege bilateral relations and programs with non-governmental organizations that are operating in those countries where the need is the greatest.

*Routine Proceedings*

We are certainly determined, as our red book has said and as our policy enunciations reiterate, to play an active role in this regard.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. As the minister is aware, the efforts of the competition bureau to increase competition in household moving have been thwarted by the IDC.

The first two new suppliers in the past 20 years have been eliminated in the first 30 days of the contract. As a result of IDC action, the only wholly Canadian owned suppliers were forced to withdraw.

Can the minister explain to this House how this came about and what action the government proposes to take in this regard?

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague has shown a great interest in this matter and I commend him for it. He will remember that the bureau of competition did conduct an exhaustive review of this particular issue. The interdepartmental committees worked on contracting procedures and found that all of these procedures did comply with all aspects of competition law.

A number of recommendations were made for increasing the competition and encouraging new companies to bid for this business. A number of measures were implemented in the past year, and as a result of the changes there were four new companies that did engage in the bidding process. It now turns out that both of the successful companies that won are run by the same person and for unknown reasons have withdrawn from the competition.

There will be further information coming on this file a little later. I want to assure the hon. member that we have taken his suggestions into consideration in the formulation of our new policy.

---

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to no fewer than 90 petitions.

**NUCLEARNON-PROLIFERATION TREATY**

**Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a few days from now representatives of 175 nations, including Canada, will gather in New York to decide the fate of the most important international arms control agreement in force today, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, NPT. Few agreements are as important to Canadian security as this key international agreement.

Today I want to outline briefly why Canada supports the indefinite and unconditional extension of the NPT and the reasons we will be encouraging others to do the same at this important conference.

(1505)

The nuclear non-proliferation treaty, of which Canada was an original signatory, entered into force in 1970. The NPT is important to Canada for three essential reasons. First, the NPT establishes a barrier to the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is the NPT's most fundamental purpose and its most outstanding success. By limiting the spread of nuclear weapons, Canada and the world are more secure as a result.

Second, the treaty provides the framework for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by establishing a system of effective international safeguards. These safeguards, implemented by the International Atomic Energy Agency, ensure that nuclear material is not being diverted to weapon programs. Canada will not sell nuclear technology to any nation that does not have a safeguard agreement with IAEA and has not signed the NPT or a regional equivalent. Our exports of nuclear technology under safeguard agreements have helped to sustain an industry that employs 20,000 people directly and another 10,000 indirectly.

Third, the treaty commits all states to work toward disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. This unique binding legal obligation, particularly as it falls on the nuclear weapons states, firmly establishes our long term goal: the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The decision we members of the NPT must make is whether to extend the treaty indefinitely or for a more limited duration. Our position is quite clear: we believe that Canadians and people around the world deserve an enduring commitment by their governments to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to pursue nuclear disarmament.

Those who argue that the NPT should not be made permanent keep open the possibility of its disappearance at some future point. This is not in anyone's interest. We must once and for all close the door on that possibility.

With the end of the cold war came an end to the nuclear arms race. It came to an end because of greater trust, openness, and cooperation between Russia and the west. That is the path to

*Routine Proceedings*

disarmament: greater security. The NPT is essential to work toward greater security and cooperation between nations.

We cannot forget that 1995 also marks the tragic 50th anniversary of the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The great American statesman Adlai Stevenson once said that evil is not in the atom but in the souls of men. Do we need a better reason to co-operate, establish and defend international laws that curb the madness of those who would act to undermine international peace and security?

The nuclear non-proliferation treaty has served Canada well for 25 years. It is now time to enshrine those benefits for future generations.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I am pleased to discuss the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, whose future is currently being decided in New York. The NPT is the most important international treaty on arms control.

Last fall, the Bloc Québécois had the opportunity to state its position on the issue of nuclear disarmament, when the joint committee conducted its review of Canada's defence policy. The emergence of new confirmed and unconfirmed nuclear powers makes the issue of nuclear disarmament more complex than ever.

This is why the Bloc Québécois strongly supports the indefinite and unconditional extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We hope that its very wide membership will be extended even more. While more than 160 nations have ratified the treaty so far, some countries which could conceivably develop such mass destruction weapons refuse to sign the treaty, thus jeopardizing the current foundations of international peace. It is important to ensure the continuity of the treaty and to improve its efficiency.

(1510)

It is possible to convince countries to do without nuclear weapons. In the past, at least four countries, namely Canada, South Africa, Brazil, and Argentina, made efforts to that end. Would it not be more efficient, and a lot more attractive for the world, to work on a multilateral agreement to eliminate such weapons, as was recently done for chemical weapons?

While the Secretary of State, Asia-Pacific, was raving about the NPT and Canada, which was one of the first two signatories to that treaty, I could not help but wonder about this government's inconsistency in the conduct of its foreign affairs.

It is a well known fact that the Canadian government is now only interested in its own commercial interests, at the expense of human rights, democracy, as well as international security.

Indeed, how can the government explain the fact that it is about to authorize and to finance, to the tune of \$2 billion, the sale of CANDU nuclear reactors to China? The Bloc Québécois feels that the government should at least demand that China comply with the NPT, rather than violate the moratorium on testing agreed to by other nuclear nations.

The sale of these reactors could undermine the international community's efforts to end nuclear proliferation.

The Canadian government's behaviour is not any better, nor any more consistent, as regards the sale of CF-5 fighter bombers to Turkey. We know that Turkey is pursuing a military offensive in northern Iraq, against Kurds. We repeatedly, but vainly, asked the government to stop negotiating that sale with Turkey.

I think you will all agree that this government is not very consistent in the conduct of its foreign affairs.

The fact that it now supports the indefinite and unconditional extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty gives us some hope. But we urge the government to show more consistency. For example, Canada could adopt a much stricter policy on co-operation in the nuclear sector. As written, the present non-proliferation policy allows nuclear exports to non-treaty countries, as long as these countries promise not to use any material to produce nuclear weapons. There must be a stricter policy in this area, if Canada wants to be consistent with its interpretation of the nuclear threat and the outbreak of military conflicts all over the world.

Canada could also innovate by suggesting strategies consistent with its interest in international peace. In this regard, for example, concrete measures could be taken. One, concerning the export of fissile materials on which Canada has a say, notably because of its radioactive material resources and its nuclear technology expertise.

Two, Canada should submit to the international court a judicial analysis establishing the illegality of nuclear arms.

[English]

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the invention of the nuclear bomb and its first use on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as we have mentioned.

These weapons created a new horror for humanity, the scope of which we have never known before. Upon witnessing the detonation of the first nuclear test explosion, Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, the director of the Manhattan project, in his shock and amazement at the devastation quoted an ancient Hindu scripture that read "I am become death, the destroyer of worlds".

It was true that for the first time in history man could destroy the earth, and nothing has been the same since. Not only did the atomic bomb magnify the horror of war, but it changed it fundamentally.

Throughout the centuries, civilian populations were largely left beyond the battlefield. At the very least, a conqueror or destroyer would be forced to fight its way through a country's defences before they could do significant harm to civilians. In other words, there was always a defence and hope.

With the creation of nuclear weapons, two things changed. First, civilians were no longer unintended victims; they were the primary targets, and they could be incinerated by the millions. Second, no matter how strong the country's defences were or how tough its army was it was still completely vulnerable to nuclear destruction.

(1515)

Responding to the threat that nuclear weapons would spread across the world, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, the NPT, was negotiated in 1970 and has been strongly supported by Canada ever since.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs has already described its key features and advantages, I will not repeat them. However, I will say that the Reform Party will give 100 per cent support to the government in its efforts to negotiate an indefinite and unconditional extension of the NPT.

For the future of our citizens and all the people of the world Canada must be a leading voice in the UN, calling for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. No good can come from such weapons of mass destruction, and their ownership should be negotiated away by all governments in good conscience.

The Reform Party sincerely hopes that the NPT can be renewed indefinitely; however, if certain countries withdraw or fail to sign on we believe the government should take into consideration whatever action it can use to promote bilateral action against those countries.

The time has come for the world to take a few large and rapid steps away from nuclear annihilation. The end of the cold war has made this possible, and now the unconditional and indefinite renewal of the NPT is the next logical step. For our collective future we must not fail in this task.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

### PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 74th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the list of the standing committee associate members.

### Routine Proceedings

With the consent of the House, I intend to propose adoption of the 74th report later today.

\* \* \*

[English]

### CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION ACT

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-87, an act to implement the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### AGREEMENT ON INTERNAL TRADE IMPLEMENTATION ACT

**Hon. Douglas Young (on behalf of Minister of Industry, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-88, an act to implement the Agreement on Internal Trade.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

\* \* \*

[English]

### BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT

**Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-323, an act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (order of discharge).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce this private member's bill today and I thank my hon. colleague for seconding introduction and first reading.

Earlier this year I was approached by a Vancouver area lawyer who told me of a concern he had with the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act. The concern is that an offender can be released from having to pay any damages arising from assault awarded in a civil law suit if they claim bankruptcy.

(1520)

The plight of the victim should take precedence over the rights of the offender. The victim in this country has suffered enough, and then to be hit with a blow that no payment for damages will be received because of a loophole in the bankruptcy act is completely unacceptable.

Many have been victimized by abusive relationships only to learn that later they will not receive the awarded damages because of a loophole in the federal statute. Fines, alimony and



*Routine Proceedings*

fraud debt are not exempted; civil damages from criminal assault should not be exempted either. Action must be taken now to amend the flawed act.

The bill I am introducing will add to the list currently in the act under section 178. The addition will be civil damages in respect of an assault or battery on a victim. The changes will give the victim more rights. Every member in the House knows the victim certainly deserves more consideration than the convicted offender.

It is an honour as a private member to have the opportunity to introduce a bill. However, I want the government to take a close look at the legislation. I know the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Justice are interested in this. I encourage the government to take it over exactly as it is.

Canadians want Parliament to be comprised of effective policy making. The way this can be done is to support any legislation that will truly benefit the country as a whole.

Since victims of crime have no party label, I invite non-partisan support for the bill from all corners of the House.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

\* \* \*

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move that the 74th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to the House earlier this day be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I will be presenting petitions under two categories.

First, the undersigned citizens draw to the attention of the House that because of the inclusion of sexual orientation in Bill C-41 it will provide those engaging in homosexual practice with special rights and privileges.

Because these special rights and privileges will be granted solely on the basis of sexual behaviour and because inclusion will infringe on the historic rights of Canadians such as freedom of religion, conscience and expression, therefore the petitioners

call on Parliament to oppose any amendments to the federal Criminal Code which would provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

## INTOXICATION DEFENCE

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition on behalf of my constituents deals with another subject.

The undersigned draw to the attention of the House that the Supreme Court of Canada has allowed extreme intoxication as a defence for sexual assault and that this ruling has also been used recently as a defence for wife assault. This ruling is regressive to women's rights and consequently provides men with additional justification to abuse women and their children.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada to allow extreme intoxication as a defence for sexual assault or physical assault.

## JUSTICE

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present another petition in the course of action undertaken on behalf of constituents who wish to halt the early release from prison of Robert Paul Thompson.

(1525 )

The petitioners I represent are concerned about making our streets safer for our citizens and are opposed to the current practice of early release of violent offenders prior to serving the full extent of their sentences.

The petitioners pray our streets will be made safer for law-abiding citizens and the families of the victims of convicted murderers.

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have been requested to table a petition signed by 63 Canadians, of whom 9 are residents in my riding.

The petitioners call on Parliament to desist from passing legislation legalizing the use of BST/rbGH in Canada. They further request legislation be passed requiring all imports produced from BST/rbGH treated cows to be so identified.

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present four petitions today.

The first petition is on the subject of official languages. The petitioners claim the majority of Canadians are opposed to this policy and demand a referendum to determine whether Canada should continue with its current policy.

*Routine Proceedings*

## FAMILY

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on the subject of the family. The petitioners request Parliament oppose any legislation that would directly or indirectly redefine family, including the provision of marriage and family benefits to those who are not related by ties of blood, marriage or adoption where marriage is defined as the legal union between a man and a woman.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition is on the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

The petitioners request that the Government of Canada not amend the human rights act to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitions fear that such an inclusion could lead to homosexuals receiving the same benefits and societal privileges as married people.

## BILL C-41

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the final petition deals with section 718.2 of Bill C-41.

The petitioners are concerned that naming specific groups in legislation will exclude other groups from protection and that sentencing based on the concept of hatred is very subjective and will undermine our justice system.

I agree with those petitions.

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions, both on the same subject, signed by over 200 residents of Canada.

These residents support the lawful and responsible use of firearms and ammunition. They state many Canadian citizens oppose laws to put more restrictions or prohibitions on legal firearms ownership rather than addressing violent criminal misuse of firearms.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament not to enact any further firearms control legislation, regulations or orders in council.

## EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Ron Fewchuk (Selkirk—Red River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions on behalf of constituents of my riding of Selkirk—Red River.

My constituents pray that Parliament continues to reject euthanasia and physician assisted suicide in Canada.

**Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present four petitions from my constituency of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

The first two petitions call on Parliament to ensure the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be vigor-

ously enforced. The petitioners also call on Parliament to make changes in the law which would allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or euthanasia.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition calls on Parliament not to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or homosexuality, including amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the phrase sexual orientation.

The final petition calls on Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation.

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Gar Knutson (Elgin—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to present three petitions. The first petition has close to 500 names on it from constituents of my riding.

The petitioners are asking that Parliament support only gun legislation which severely punishes any violent criminal who uses a weapon including a weapon other than a firearm, protects the rights and freedoms of law-abiding recreational firearms users to own and use firearms responsibly and repeals firearms control legislation which features tortuous language and has been characterized as one of the most horrifying examples of bad draftsmanship.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Gar Knutson (Elgin—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition has 36 names on it.

The petitioners are calling on Parliament to put an end to discriminatory treatment in Canada of gay and lesbian citizens and their familiar relationships by amending federal legislation which currently allows unequal treatment, including an amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation.

(1530)

## JUSTICE

**Mr. Gar Knutson (Elgin—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition contains over 150 names.

The petitioners are requesting that the Criminal Code of Canada and any other relevant acts be amended so that extreme drunkenness as a defence in any criminal case cannot be used.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to present a petition today signed by British Columbians, the majority of whom are from my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby.

*Government Orders*

The petitioners beginning with Peggy MacDonald of New Westminster pray that Parliament not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights act to include in the prohibitive grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

\* \* \*

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Question No. 171 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 171—**Mr. Harper (Calgary West):**

With regard to the closure of Canadian Forces Base Calgary, (a) how much will it cost to clean up the entire base, including both barracks, training grounds, etc., to a state where the grounds could be resold or returned to the lessor, and how are those costs allocated, (b) what other similar clean-ups have been done, and how much did they cost, (c) what renovations and improvements were done to CFB Calgary in the last year, and how much did they cost, (d) what costs will be incurred to move all equipment and personnel from CFB Calgary to Edmonton, (e) what changes will be needed at CFB Edmonton to accommodate the personnel and equipment transferred from CFB Calgary, and what are the associated cost estimates, and (f) what additional renovations/maintenance costs are anticipated over the next 10 years for CFB Edmonton?

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** The following table addresses parts (a) to (f) of the question posed:

		(\$M)
a. Clean up costs	Harvey Barracks and Sarcee Range, Budget 94 <sup>1</sup>	40
	Currie Barracks, Budget 95	3
Total		43
b. Similar clean-ups	Summerside	0.9
	Cornwallis	0.2
c. Renovations at Calgary last year	Maintenance, roof repairs, etc.	3.8
d. Personnel and equipment move costs	Budget 94	11
	Budget 95	8
Total		19
e. Edmonton construction costs to accommodate personnel and equipment transferred from Calgary	Budget 94	21
	Budget 95	100
Total		121

f. Maintenance/renovation costs at Edmonton for next 10 years

As the majority of infrastructure will be new or newly renovated as of 1998, it is anticipated that little capital investment will be required over the next 10 years in Edmonton. Maintenance costs will be similar to CFB Calgary, approximately \$2 to \$3 million per year

Note: <sup>1</sup> Environmental clean-up is a condition of the lease for the aboriginal lands. Clean-up must be done whenever the department vacates the land. Delay in this area would increase the cost.

[English]

**Mr. Milliken:** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before proceeding to orders of the day I wish to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 33(2) Government Orders will be extended by 13 minutes because of the ministerial statement.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**CODE OF CONDUCT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion and the amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Resuming debate. I give the floor to the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who had approximately 12 minutes left.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude the remarks I had started a little earlier today regarding the whole issue of public morality. It has to be pointed out in this debate that the whole issue had been left lying around for a few years under the previous administration. Of course, as the old saying goes, what is left lying around gets dirty. It is true.

Legislation was introduced in 1987 as Bill C-114. It was then reprinted as Bill C-46, reprinted again as Bill C-43 and referred—in 1991—to a parliamentary committee. The committee put forward, in its report dated June 1992, a new draft bill. The government used that draft, together with our recommendations, to introduce new legislation, i.e. Bill C-116. The new bill introduced in the House by the government was found lacking, but the minister responsible, Harvie Andre, refused to amend

*Government Orders*

the bill to make it acceptable, with the result that the whole issue was dropped. No wonder some people think that legislators did drag their feet on this issue. It is true.

I do not intend to deny what happened. I took part in the discussion and sat on the committee examining Bill C-116, and I realized that so much time had gone by that some documents were becoming badly outdated. For example, the report of the Parker Commission on the dealings of Sinclair and Noreen Stevens was just about forgotten and we did not have a clear recollection of its recommendations. It was not easy to examine the whole issue.

However, the issue has not lost any of its importance and we must deal with it. That is why I congratulate the House leader on this motion. Hon. members will remember that the red book stated quite clearly that this issue and that of lobbying would be discussed.

We have dealt first with the lobbying issue. I congratulate all members who contributed. They did a great job. The bill has now reached the third reading stage in the House, and I am sure it will be passed in the next few days. We are now ready to move to the next issue, that of a code of conduct and a conflict of interest code for members of both Houses.

(1535)

It is important to examine that issue right after concluding committee hearings on lobbying because both issues are related to a certain extent, which is a good reason to proceed right away. Also, it is important for the government to act now in order to show the public that it definitely intends to settle these issues and not to drag things out, as we saw under previous governments.

By introducing this bill, the government is acting with good intentions. As our House leader said earlier, all kinds of questions will be raised. I remember Bill C-116 and all the errors it contained. It was so badly drafted that people under one set of rules were subject to another set and vice versa.

You have to remember that this whole conflict of interest issue really affects three groups. First, there are the members of Parliament and the senators, the so-called ordinary parliamentarians. Then, there are the parliamentarians who are also public office holders; in other words, the ministers and parliamentary secretaries. Finally, there are the order in council appointees, or the top brass of the public service.

So, you have these three groups and then you have a very interesting area, the one where some parliamentarians are also public office holders, because under the Westminster parliamentary system in use in Canada and in several other countries, members of the executive branch of government sit in the House. They are both ministers and parliamentarians. Under such circumstances, you have to determine which system they will be subject to. Will they be subject to the rules applying to

public servants and other public office holders or to the code developed for parliamentarians? This was an interesting question which was examined by the committee studying Bill C-43 and then Bill C-116.

We concluded, or rather the government at the time concluded, since our recommendations were slightly different, that the system applying to public servants had to apply at the same time to ministers and other public office holders who are also parliamentarians, but that for backbenchers there should be a separate system. The reason for this type of distinction is simple; it is because a system administered by the government cannot bind members of Parliament.

I find it difficult to imagine that the hon. member for Bellechasse, for example, would agree to be judged by a system reporting to the Prime Minister. Indeed, I would not blame him for refusing. I would not agree to it myself if I were a member of the opposition. Consequently, what we need is a committee reporting to the House to judge conflict of interest cases for parliamentarians.

But, of course, at the same time, we must establish a system by which the member for Bellechasse or another member may ask questions of the Prime Minister concerning the conduct of ministers, questions like the following: "Mr. Prime Minister, since you are the boss, how can you tolerate such and such an action by one of your colleagues and what measures will you take?"

(1540)

Of course, in a case like that, we would not expect the Prime Minister to say: "No, I am not in charge of these cases, an officer of the House is". The Prime Minister must have the authority to take the necessary disciplinary measures and he must also be responsible in order to be in a position to answer the questions asked by all those who want to make our Parliament accountable, as they have the duty to do.

We will examine issues such as these in our committee. We already know that, in this House, it will be the committee on procedure, of which my colleague opposite, the hon. member for Bellechasse, is a member. Since he is a law professor, I know that he will be able to bring significant input to the work of that committee, as will several other parliamentarians. They will all help us produce a code of conduct that is both acceptable, so that people are not discouraged from running for public office, and strict enough to ensure good conduct and public morality.

I recognize that it is not always easy to rule in this area. I had to deal with such cases for several years when I was the opposition critic for government administration. I look forward to the proceedings of the committee.

But I disagree with some hon. members from the opposition who want to exclude from the committee members from the other place.

*Government Orders*

I must tell you that the code of conduct has to apply not only to members of the House, but to senators as well. I said it at the beginning of my speech and I will say it again, I ask members who propose that senators not be included in this exercise to reconsider their position because we may be talking about amending the Criminal Code, the Standing Orders of the House, the Rules of the Senate and the Parliament of Canada Act. These laws and some of these rules need to be amended by both houses of Parliament. I am sure that members opposite know that, as does the member for Bellechasse.

So we have to work together to be able to make the necessary changes to the rules in this place and in the other place. Why would we want to adopt a code of conduct regarding conflicts of interest for the members of this House and exempt the members of the other place? I have to tell you that I do not understand why people would want to do such a thing. As a matter of fact, just recently, some members opposite asked questions about a member of the other place who allegedly found himself in a conflict of interest situation or something like that. We know that it was not true, that the allegation came from the media and that the reporter who made the allegation had to retract, but the fact remains that such questions were asked.

That proves that both houses of Parliament must work together to make better rules. That is what I intend to do personally as a parliamentarian who is interested in this issue.

Therefore, I urge the official opposition to withdraw its motion to exempt the Senate from the rules that we want to adopt for parliamentarians.

[English]

I hope we work together to arrive at a good code of conduct for members of both Houses of Parliament. In so doing I hope, because it is not the whole picture, that in part we will contribute toward a better acceptance and a better view by Canadians of what we do to govern the country honestly and appropriately. I am sure that is the intention of all members of both Houses.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that members of Parliament have some clearly defined rules for dealing with lobbyists. It is important that the Senate have this as well but perhaps it is not incumbent upon this House to enact rules for the unelected Senate. It first has to clean its own house and then develop its own rules.

(1545)

Lobbying has long been one of those grey areas where the concept has been accepted but frowned upon depending upon who was actually doing it. If organizations such as firefighters lobby to make Parliament aware of problems within their profession, it is considered to be quite acceptable. If business

lobbies for a particular advantage, then it becomes less clear. If that business lobbies using its own existing personnel, it is generally considered more acceptable than if it hires somebody to lobby on its behalf.

There is a bit of hypocrisy in this attitude. Lobbying is either right or wrong. We should not be making judgments based solely on who is doing the lobbying. This is one of the first issues that Motion No. 23 should address.

Another area of lobbying that needs to be addressed by Motion No. 23 is what constitutes excessive lobbying. If lobbying is a legal activity with no definition as to who can do it or how much can be done, how can any level of activity be considered excessive under the current unregulated structure?

A lack of specific guidelines for elected members and for that matter the lobbyists themselves have caused many problems for both. It is appropriate to spend some time reviewing one of those problems.

During the 1993 election the Liberals took aim at the Pearson Development Corporation contract to redevelop terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson International Airport. The main hue and cry that they raised was that of excessive lobbying which led to a largely patronage deal which should be cancelled.

Was this contract an example of excessive lobbying? Did that lobbying lead to a patronage deal? To determine this, let us start at the beginning.

Terminal 3 had already been privatized and there was no particular objection to this. In September 1989 the Matthews group submitted an unsolicited bid for the privatization of terminals 1 and 2. The proposal was not accepted. Two and one-half years later in March 1992, the government issued a request for proposal for the privatization of terminals 1 and 2.

One of the Liberals' claims was that the original bid was a form of lobbying and that the original proposal gave the proposers an unfair advantage in their bidding in 1992. If the request for a proposal had followed on the heels of the unsolicited bid, there may have been some justification for such an argument.

Two and one-half years later, a claim such as that is totally invalid. Although there were and still are no guidelines for lobbying, the Liberals pushed forward with their claim that lobbying in the Pearson contract was excessive. This brings me back to my earlier question, how can lobbying be considered excessive to the point of justifying the cancellation of a contract if there are no guidelines to compare it to?

A motorist was driving down the street at the legal speed limit on a clear day when another driver pulled out in front of the motorist and a collision occurred. At the inquiry after the accident it was determined that the speed limit followed by the

*Government Orders*

first driver was too high given the limited visibility for vehicles entering the street in that area.

The inquiry recommended that the speed be reduced. This does not make the first driver guilty of speeding. The speed limit cannot be retroactively reduced. This, however, is exactly what the Liberals were trying to do with regard to lobbying in the Pearson contract.

There is no definition of excessive and no evidence that there was any abnormal amount of lobbying in the pursuit of the contract. The Liberals, who by this time had formed the government, cancelled the contract citing excessive lobbying and resultant patronage.

At the time of the last election the Pearson contract was very controversial. Allegations of excessive lobbying and patronage flowed freely. Prime reasons for these accusations were not those directly involved in the contract. Rather, it was the fact that it was put together by the Mulroney government which was by then looked upon as unscrupulous and possibly corrupt.

The Pearson contract was a victim of election rhetoric, which I was caught up in as well. I was one of the voices that questioned whether or not the contract holders were entitled to any compensation if the accusations levelled against them were true.

The leader of the Liberal Party stated that if the Liberals formed the government, they would review the contract process and cancel that contract if they found problems in the process. So far so good as far as I was concerned.

As promised, the new Prime Minister set out to review the contract. For that purpose he appointed Robert Nixon as the sole person responsible for carrying out the 30-day review. Nixon was a long time Liberal Party supporter, father of a sitting Liberal MP and was rewarded for his \$80,000 report by being appointed chairman of Atomic Energy of Canada, not exactly an auspicious beginning for a party decrying claims of patronage regarding the signing of the Pearson contract. The Nixon review did not interview under oath, talked only to certain people excluding some of the principals involved, and did not allow an opportunity for any of the testimony to be rebutted.

(1550)

The report stated that the deal was bad and should be cancelled but did not produce one word of evidence to support that claim. Again the general allegation of excessive lobbying was raised as one of the major justifications.

The Nixon report was the rationale for the Liberal's Bill C-22 which not only cancelled the contract but allowed the government to decide for itself who got compensated and how much

they got. It also allowed the government to insinuate the deal was crooked because of tactics such as lobbying without allowing the accused to clear their names and reputations in a court of law.

This is a very interesting strategy for the Liberals and it would have worked was it not for all the evidence to the contrary that started to surface. At that point they tried to expand their rhetoric to suggest that it was not a good deal financially but the evidence does not support this either.

The legislation was subject to a debate in the House of Commons. When it reached the committee stage, I started to realize that the flaw in the process may not have been in the awarding of the contract but rather the way in which the contract was cancelled. Many of the witnesses requested by either me or the Bloc representative did not appear and the Liberal dominated committee refused to press those people to attend.

The most significant person to be requested and not appear was Robert Nixon. In his case it was not a matter of not showing up but rather a refusal of the majority of the committee to invite him. The committee response to the request was: You have his report, what do you need him for?

One witness of note who did appear was Sandy Morrison of Air Canada who was the main anchor tenant in the contract. Air Canada spoke strongly in favour of the contract and requested that it proceed as quickly as possible.

By this time it had been decided by the government to set up another Liberal long time supporter and former law partner of the Prime Minister, Robert Wright, to review the compensation claims and to make a report to the minister. From this report the minister would decide who got paid and how much they would receive. Compensation was to be limited to out of pocket claims only with no consideration of any further request including lobbying costs and third party claims against the Pearson Development Corporation.

The report and the decision would be confidential and would be protected from access to information by making it a cabinet document which is protected for 20 years. I questioned why this process was bypassing the transport committee and cloaking itself in secrecy. I did not receive a satisfactory answer.

I believe it is proper that we examine the results of the Liberals' false vendetta against the Pearson group so that we can fully understand the importance of lobbying guidelines and what happens when no such guidelines exist.

As I earlier stated, when it appeared the accusation of excessive lobbying alone would not be enough to justify the cancelling of the contract, the Liberals then tried to suggest it was not a good financial deal to cover up the fact that the real

*Government Orders*

reason for cancelling the deal was political gain. As evidence later showed, the Liberals knew from the very beginning that it was not a bad financial deal but they had painted themselves into a political corner and they did not know how to get out.

Through access to information, I came into the possession of a secret government document dated October 29, 1993, supplied to Robert Nixon for his review of the Pearson contract. This document was supplied by William Rowat, associate deputy minister of transport. In that document it is clearly stated that the rate of return to the crown from the contract is considerably better than the crown construction option and that the Pearson Development Corporation return on investment was endorsed as reasonable by both the Department of Finance and an independent financial consultant hired by the government.

A second government document dated November 4, 1993 later appeared through court disclosure which further elaborates on the financial feasibility of the contract. This second document was also used to give direction to Nixon. It pointed out that in order for the crown construction option to generate revenues equivalent to the private sector deal, a real revenue growth factor of 10 per cent per year until cost recovery was completed would be necessary.

Historically speaking, the government management growth in revenues has been at or below inflation, projected for the purpose of the analysis at 3 per cent per annum. Using a more realistic real revenue growth rate of 3.5 per cent per year, the crown construction option would have realized \$250 million less over the term of the contract than through the privatization method.

(1555)

The second government document also discusses the possible cost of cancelling the contract. The options identified are: negotiate or expropriate, which leave the government open to damages ranging from \$500 million to \$2 billion; or legislate, which could limit the government's liability but leave it open to many more potential problems including severe capacity and congestion problems, increased costs and the undermining of government leasing and contracting processes if it is seen as a precedent.

The document also discusses the possibility of renegotiating or restructuring the contract, but it makes it very clear that this is not a desirable option. Nowhere in that document does it suggest that Nixon should examine the deal to see if it is clean and if so, to recommend that it proceed. From this it seems very obvious to conclude that Nixon was directed toward a very specific outcome.

I have never questioned the government's right to cancel the Pearson airport contract. In light of all the information that is now available, I might question the wisdom of the cancellation,

but not the right to do so. With that right goes an obligation to see that justice is done, which does not appear to be happening in the handling of this contract.

All of this has been initiated by the Liberal government which was looking for an election issue and seized upon Pearson airport as a viable victim. It utilized a lack of any lobbying guidelines as a way to try to justify its actions. What is the impact of this flagrant attempt to utilize the lack of lobbying guidelines? It can be looked at by a complete factual and documented review of the impact on Pearson airport.

I will pass over commenting on that part because I will be short of time. There is so much evidence on this contract, but I have to move along.

Allow me to mention another aspect of this whole process in which the fact that the Pearson International Airport is involved at all is wholly coincidental. That aspect is the rule of law.

Under Bill C-22 the government is allowed to cancel a signed contract and decide for itself who gets what compensation. It also allows it to insinuate that the deal and those involved in it were crooked without allowing the accused to clear their names and reputations in a court of law.

What that government action does is pronounce a group of Canadians guilty until proven innocent and then removes their right to prove their innocence. This action relates much more to a dictatorship than it does to a democracy.

All of this started as a result of an opportunity for the Liberals to seek political gain by utilizing the fact that there were no guidelines for dealing with lobbyists or lobbying activities.

Motion No. 23 will not only provide clear and long overdue guidelines for all MPs when dealing with lobbyists, it will protect the public from unscrupulous action by a political party. It may even protect the Liberals from their own tendency toward election rhetoric.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the goal of the motion before us today is to strike a special joint committee of the House and the Senate to review the weighty issue of parliamentary ethics.

We are counting on this committee to establish a practical and realistic code of conduct which will help balance the official responsibilities and personal interests of MPs and Senators. This issue obviously affects each member of this House personally while having a wider, much more fundamental scope: it also affects all Canadians. Our conduct as individuals and as a group, in fact, determines the level of confidence that Canadians have in parliamentarians. The way we carry out our daily tasks as parliamentarians molds our institution's image. The trust of

*Government Orders*

those who elected us to this noble House is either earned or lost by our conduct from day to day.

The important issues of trust, credibility and ethics are at the heart of the agenda we presented to Canadians during the last election campaign.

In fact, we devoted an entire chapter of our red book to parliamentary integrity. We clearly stated the principles whereby we recognize the following: "The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable". We also recognized that the Canadian government would be unable to play the constructive role which it must unless, first and foremost, it restores the integrity of our political institutions.

(1600)

Since being elected 18 months ago, we have made considerable progress in this area. We reinforced the code of conduct for cabinet members and senior officials. We also appointed an ethics counsellor to help our officials apply these rules correctly. We drastically reduced the range of political appointments.

My colleague, the President of the Privy Council, examined the role and operations of 120 agencies, commissions, councils and advisory committees. At the end of this exercise, on February 16 he announced that 665 positions filled by order in council appointments would be abolished. He ordered 73 agencies to be closed down and 47 others to be restructured.

This initiative alone will save the government as much as \$10 million annually. However, it is more than just a matter of efficiency and saving money. It is also an indication that the government does not intend to use political appointments as a way to reward its supporters.

We also reformed the pension plan of members of Parliament which for too long has been a source of controversy. Last week, there was a debate in this House on a bill that will provide a framework for the activities of lobbyists, and today, we are about to create a committee to develop a code of conduct to guide senators and members of the House of Commons.

It is this systematic, methodical and orderly approach to questions that touch on ethical issues that is now helping to restore public confidence in our political institutions.

In an impressive speech yesterday to a meeting of Liberal militants in Trois-Rivières, our Prime Minister once again stressed the importance of integrity and ethical conduct. He pointed out that after 18 months in government, no member of cabinet had resigned or been dismissed for ethical reasons. During a comparable period, the previous government saw at least six resignations from cabinet.

I am not saying we are perfect. To err is human, and errors of judgment do occur, but by acting prudently, according to clear-cut rules, we will, both individually and collectively, manage to restore the trust of our fellow citizens.

The role of parliamentarians is difficult and often complex. Society expects all individuals to be as free as possible to manage their economic interests. It also expects that those in public office will not, in the exercise of their duties, be involved in matters in which they have personal financial interests. Some feel that Parliament should enact stiffer laws, others fear that stricter rules will discourage competent individuals from becoming involved in public affairs.

We are looking for a balance. We want rules strict enough to prevent practices contravening the code of ethics and to maintain the reputation of Parliament and parliamentarians among the public. However, we do not want rules that discourage competent individuals from entering public life and serving their fellow citizens. We must strike a balance that allows us to attract the people who are best prepared and most able to lead the country and have them governed by a set of rules that will keep them above all suspicion.

Conflicts of interest are not new. They have always existed. What has changed are people's and taxpayers' attitudes and levels of tolerance.

(1605)

We have a practical and precise code of ethics governing members of Cabinet and their staff, parliamentary secretaries and senior public servants. We have nothing, however, for members of Parliament and senators. Traditionally, the public has felt they had little importance, individually, in the decision making process. I must disagree.

Members of Parliament have increasing influence on the process. Their role in the various parliamentary committees is growing in importance. Their influence in their individual caucuses is expanding, and their votes on bills before the House is always decisive.

On each issue, in each debate, members of Parliament must reflect, analyze the effect of their decisions on the lives of their constituents and decide on their individual approaches. They are entirely free to defend their viewpoint in the legislative process. They may propose changes and amendments, they may influence their colleagues' thinking. This process of analysis and choice is repeated hundreds of times during the mandate of a member of Parliament. This is why we have a Parliament and this is why members are elected.

However, throughout our term of office, we remain full fledged citizens. We are all taxpayers and consumers. Most of us are parents and many own property. In this regard, we are very much like Canadians as a whole. We may therefore assume that



*Government Orders*

these essentially undistinguishing characteristics have very little influence on our behaviour as legislators. Some criteria are more regional or specific in nature.

Some parliamentarians share the concerns of their constituents, in areas such as agriculture, fisheries or natural resources for example. Family businesses raise some problems because they encompass a whole range of assets, profits or debts and financial interests. It is usually interests such as these which are covered by conflict of interest legislation.

Maybe we should first of all agree on what constitutes a conflict of interest. There are several definitions. Mr. Justice Parker defined the real conflict of interest as a situation where a minister—or a member of Parliament or a senator—is aware of private financial interests sufficient to exert some influence on the performance of his other official duties and responsibilities.

Therefore, rules must be defined in order to prevent the financial interests of parliamentarians from exerting an influence on the decisions they make while exercising their duties. Several control methods have been tested over the years. Some have proven to be efficient. The first one is disclosure, that is the disclosure of one's assets to a designated person. This information can then be recorded for reference purposes or be made public. When their private interests are known, the holders of public office are less tempted to act in their own interest.

Prevention forces parliamentarians to divest themselves of interests or associations which may distort their judgment, either by selling the interests to third parties with whom they are at arm's length, or by placing them in blind trusts. Finally, relinquishing these interests will prevent parliamentarians from intervening in matters involving personal gain.

Any code of ethics contains a number of such controls. It will be up to the special joint committee members to review these mechanisms and to decide whether they should apply to MPs and senators or whether it would be more desirable to resort to some other kind of control. The committee has all the latitude it needs to consult experts, and to consult with those to whom the code of conduct will apply, in order to come up with a firm, clear and realistic code. The committee will have to take into account the fact that parliamentarians carry on other activities in parallel with their legislative work.

(1610)

Members from all parties manage significant budgets, their budget as MPs. They must use this money wisely and prudently. MPs represent the citizens of their riding. It is an important part of their mandate. This requires regular attendance and the necessary amount of time. Finally, MPs are often required to represent Canada and Parliament abroad.

These many facets of an MP's mandate raise a number of questions which the committee will probably want to review in detail. First, the committee will certainly want to set rules to avoid conflicts of interest. It will certainly want to question the judiciousness of allowing MPs and senators to pursue other professional activities during their mandate. It will also want to analyze the conditions surrounding our parliamentarians' public or private visits abroad. We want to make sure that these activities are entirely compatible with the Parliament's objectives of transparency and integrity.

The committee will certainly want to review all the rules we are subjected to at the present time. They need to be evaluated to see if they are sufficiently clear, strict and practical for every parliamentarian to be able to abide by them. Finally, the committee has been given the specific mandate to study the relationship between parliamentarians and lobbyists. I believe all members want lobbying activities to be well defined and they will be happy to implement the rules established by the committee.

The committee's task will not be an easy one. Several attempts have been made to give Parliament a code of conduct and they all failed along the way. This time however, there is a political will. This government has said its administration would focus on ethics. This time, all members of all political parties want to restore confidence in Parliament. We have all chosen to serve the public. We want to do it honestly, freely and openly. Even though they might be restrictive, the present rules of ethics governing many of us are precious tools that help us carry out our mandate in a transparent and effective manner.

Quite often, we question the pertinence of an action, the necessity of an intervention, the timeliness of an initiative. In such instances of doubt and questioning, the rules of ethics give us the information and support we need to make the right decisions.

So I ask all members of this House to support and help those who must develop that new code of conduct. Their work and wisdom will profit not only each and every one of us in Parliament, but also Canadians as a whole.

I know that the Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, proposed an amendment to exclude the Senate from this exercise. I know very well that the position of the Bloc is to ignore the Senate, but this is not the problem today. The Senate is part of our parliamentary institutions, it completes Parliament. If we want to establish a code of conduct which will make Quebecers and Canadians look upon their politicians with confidence in all their activities, and if we want to proceed according to the rules, can we disregard the other place? We have a two chamber Parliament and until that is changed I do not believe that we can give ourselves a set of rules and leave the other place without such rules, if we want to settle this question once and for all. For the last decade or so, I think each Parliament has studied this difficult, but important issue.

*Government Orders*

(1615)

As I said earlier, I believe that this time the government and the other political parties are willing to adopt a code of conduct. Such a code should not be an half-baked affair. It should be complete and we should support the motion of the government House leader so the Special Joint Committee of the House and the Senate can start its work as soon as possible, with a view to making recommendations that will provide members and senators with a tool which will allow them to represent the people of Canada with pride and dignity. That is why we are here.

*[English]*

I hope that by the end of the day, or whenever this debate is finished, the House can give a clear mandate to the special joint committee, supported by all parties, all members of Parliament, and the Senate, so that the committee can begin its mandate and can come back to both Houses with a full report and recommendations once and for all, after so many years.

I tried before I prepared my speech to go back as far as I could to see how many reports have been made. There are many. I know the previous government tried four bills and never succeeded.

I believe this time the government, the opposition parties, and all members of Parliament are clearly interested in solving this problem and giving a clear code of ethics. We can succeed. In order to succeed we must be united so that we can give a clear mandate to the committee. I hope when the question is put we are united in creating this special joint committee as soon as possible.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the hon. member who just spoke. He told us that in the red book and throughout the election campaign, the Liberals had called for openness and proposed the appointment of an independent ethics counsellor directly accountable to the Prime Minister. He added that the House was now considering a bill which could allow it to have a code of conduct.

My question for the hon. member who just spoke is this: Would a code of conduct have had precedence over the ethics counsellor appointed by the Prime Minister in the matter involving, on the one hand, the Prime Minister's son-in-law and, on the other hand, the decision made by the CRTC?

Would the ethics counsellor have had more power with a code of conduct to take the Minister of Canadian Heritage to task concerning the letter that he passed on to the CRTC on behalf of one applicant? He himself sent a letter to the CRTC.

With a code of conduct, would the ethics counsellor allow the government, when it calls for tenders, to accept the lowest acceptable bid?

Also, what would have happened in the case of Pearson airport if we had had a code of conduct and an ethics counsellor? Would the ethics counsellor, with a code of conduct, have prevented the Liberal government from organizing brunches at \$1,000 a plate which allow the lobbyists, the following day, to knock on the doors of Liberal members?

I must say also that, compared to the red book, the Liberals are now doing the exact opposite of what they were preaching when they were in the opposition and the Conservatives formed the government.

Now that we have an ethics counsellor, with a code of conduct what happened, and what is going to happen to the 30 Liberal members who stayed in their offices because they opposed the Justice minister's firearms bill? And what is going to happen to the three Liberal members who voted against their own government and who lost their seats on various committees and commissions?

(1620)

The main questions are: Where are the openness and the credibility of the Liberal government as far as the code of conduct is concerned? And, is the code of conduct going to prevent the members of the Bloc Québécois from speaking about sovereignty?

**Mr. Gagliano:** Mr. Speaker, I will start by using the word used by the honourable member, and that is transparency. I believe that in all the points he raised and which I will try to deal with one by one, there is a question of transparency.

Let us take the decision of the CRTC which has been raised repeatedly during oral question period, over the past few days. The government established a committee which examined this issue and asked all the stakeholders to make representations. The work of the committee was made public and its decision was also made public, so that it could be discussed in the House.

Second, as the Prime Minister said, he did not take part in the discussions and decision in Cabinet. I raise this issue because it affects the members of our families. Does the fact that I have been elected to Parliament or received an appointment as minister mean that my son cannot pursue his career as an accountant?

Therefore transparency is important because it allows disclosure. The same thing applies to the famous letter sent by the Minister of Canadian Heritage to the CRTC. The Prime Minister was immediately informed of the problem. He made the letter public in this very House, and the whole issue was made public.

As I said earlier, we are all humans and a code of ethics or an ethics counsellor will never solve every problem entirely. The

*Government Orders*

important thing, however, is the will to ensure that things are done with transparency and honesty.

That is what this government promised to do in its red book and this is what it has done since its election on October 23 or since the day the government was formed on November 4.

The disclosure of information on politicians is very important because it will ensure that nothing is kept hidden and that transparency becomes a fact. We will thus avoid criticism and we will make our decisions in accordance with the rules of disclosure and transparency.

It is not easy. Our task today is very difficult. We have to make decisions and pass judgments. People will watch us and will also pass judgments. Therefore we must be logical and transparent in our actions.

Therefore I can say to the hon. member that I am proud of the 18 months of Liberal government under Jean Chrétien. Furthermore, despite the list mentioned by my colleague, this government enjoys the highest rate of popular support recorded since polls were begun in Canada.

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, once again, the government is hiding behind a motion. Does it ever like to delay proceedings in the House! A motion to create a committee to conduct another study. For more than 20 years, almost 25 years, various attempts by successive governments have met with repeated failure.

Had the government even the slightest political will to find a solution to the issue of conflict of interest, it would not have been satisfied with a vague motion to create a committee, but would have tabled a public bill improving on the ones that failed in the House.

(1625)

The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell mentioned Bill C-116 earlier, which finally died on the Order Paper during the previous 34th Parliament. It would probably have been possible to rewrite and refine Bill C-116 with the government policy, while taking into account the views of the opposition. But no. We are being proposed today a motion to create a joint committee made up of eight senators and 14 members of Parliament.

Fortunately, the amendment moved by the hon. member for La Prairie proposes that the committee no longer be a joint committee, but a House committee made up only of members of Parliament. The member for La Prairie even changes the membership; there would be 12 members of Parliament: seven Liberals, three members from the official opposition and two from the second opposition party, which seems fair and reasonable at first glance.

We do not need a joint committee. This House, which is made up of elected people, has its own rules and its own vision of things, while the Senate, which is made up of non elected people who are in office until the age of 75, also has its own different way of seeing things, a way with which we are not always comfortable working. Had the government wanted to involve both Houses in the development of a code of conduct, the best way of doing it would have been to table a bill. Of course, both this House and the Senate would have had to pass this bill before it could receive Royal Assent.

Instead, the government decided to create a working committee, another one. If we are to create such a committee, we should at least let the elected members study, by themselves, what constitutes a conflict of interest in their case. After all, after a maximum of five years, these people must go back to their constituents. They are accountable for their actions; they must explain why they took such and such political decisions. We should have this right, since our colleagues in the Senate do not have this sensitive test to pass. All they need is the Governor General's signature to be in office until the respectable age of 75.

Perhaps it could be interesting to get the other place's point of view, but certainly not in a joint committee. Moreover, such a committee would probably resurrect five Conservative senators whose party was literally eliminated by the Canadians in the October 1993 election and does not have official party status anymore in this House. It would be a way to give back a voice to people that want to be heard, these days. Last week-end, they stated their case in Hull, and with this motion, they would do so in a joint committee made up of members of Parliament and senators.

If nothing but to respect the will of the people, we should reject the creation of a joint committee. The referendum on the Charlottetown accord showed that the people rejected the Senate reforms, particularly in Quebec. The idea of a triple E Senate, that is equal, elected and efficient, was certainly not endorsed. The proposal was for six senators per province, regardless of the size of the province, and it was rejected.

Now, the government party wants an elected Senate, while the Reform Party wants a triple E Senate, which means that there is disagreement on the number of Es. For our part, we want a triple A Senate, that is to say abolished, abolished and abolished. No other institution in the world is denounced by as many people as is this other place we have in the Canadian Parliament. There is no reason for a non-elected house to continue to exist in 1995. Perhaps there was a need for it in 1867, but before 1867, the two Houses we had in the Province of Canada were elected. The legislative assembly of the Province of Canada was an elected assembly. Starting in 1854, the legislative council, which had been an appointed institution since 1840, became an elected one. This means that until 1867, we had two elected Houses. What

*Government Orders*

happened in 1867 that caused this split, with one house, the House of Commons, being elected, and the other, the Senate of Canada, not?

(1630)

The preamble of the British North America Act, or BNA Act, 1867, can shed some light on this. In 1867, it was stated in this preamble that the Dominion of Canada wanted to have institutions similar to those of the United Kingdom. What were these institutions in 1867, and what are they still today? The House of Commons, like in Canada, and the House of Lords, made up of peers. Because we did not and still do not have an aristocracy in Canada, we invented our own lords, whom were called senators. Originally, they were appointed for life. But in 1965, the Canadian Constitution was amended so that a senator's tenure of office ends at age 75, while grandfathering the rights of those who were already sitting in the Senate at the time but had not yet reached the age of 75.

Since then, as we can see clearly, the role of the other House has become less important. The Senate now sits some 40 days a year and cannot introduce money bills under section 53 of the 1867 British North America Act. The house of sober second thought likes to drag things out, as demonstrated by the electoral boundaries readjustment bill, the GST legislation introduced by the previous government and other bills that may be filibustered by the other house in the future. Given the cost to Canadian society, I think that we could do without it.

If we asked Canadians, "Do you agree that the Senate should be abolished?", a very high percentage of them would say yes. The problem is, what should we replace it with and how should it be done? Responses vary. There is no consensus on replacement.

I, of course, am eager to support the amendment tabled by the hon. member for La Prairie to restrict committee membership to members of the House of Commons. If the Senate wants to strike its own committee, it will do so.

The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said a little earlier this afternoon that our institutions, including Parliament, were based on the Westminster model, while the hon. member for Saint-Léonard made some comments to that effect.

I heard earlier today our colleague, the hon. member for Elk Island, point out that we ranked 36th in the public's esteem, just before used car salesmen. It is probably because we have to defend a used system that should be refurbished, a system that, in the past 50 years, has seen a virtual takeover of the legislative power by the executive power. That was not the case previously, as we can see by looking at history. When our parliamentary ancestors fought to abolish or appropriate royal powers, they insisted that these powers should be held by the House of Commons.

(1635)

Over time, royal powers shifted from the palace not to the House of Commons but to the Prime Minister's Office. It is there that important decisions are made.

In our constitutional system, which consists of three powers: the legislative, the judiciary and the executive, the legislative branch is, for all practical purposes, under the control of the executive, which in turn is under the control of the Prime Minister's Office.

We have the advantage, and sometimes the disadvantage, of having a neighbour that has inspired us to reform. Our American neighbours have inspired us to carry out some institutional reforms that may not be in our best interests. In a system in which the executive is elected and accountable to the population and not to the American Congress, a system in which members of the House of Representatives and the Senate are elected and not accountable to the executive, the situation is quite different.

In the U.S., what did the political parties decide to do? They decided to choose their party leaders, their candidates for the presidential election, at an all-members convention. We adopted this idea in Canada, so that some of our party leaders are elected by delegates at a general convention while others are elected by all party members.

In principle, this is great, but when we want to apply this to our parliamentary institutions, we face a big problem. The problem is that, when the party leader is also the Prime Minister, the party leader has practically unlimited power. First, to his cabinet colleagues, he can say: "Look, if you are here, it is because I appointed you". To his caucus, he can say: "I do not feel very accountable to you. After all, you are not the ones who elected me party leader. I am accountable to the party members who elected me". The problem is that supporters have no control over what the government party does.

You will see self-congratulatory conventions like the one held in Trois-Rivières, of course, but no real debate on party policies. The intent of the Constitution Act, 1867, was to have institutions similar to those of the United Kingdom. In Great Britain, the Prime Minister is elected by his or her peers. This means that the party leader is elected from within the caucus, *primus inter pares*, as the Latin saying goes. This was a much more subtle way of governing and a much more equitable one, since the Prime Minister was accountable first and foremost—and in Great Britain this is still the case—to his colleagues or peers.

The role of member of Parliament is all the more important, since members can ask and expect to obtain from their leader the answers they need to continue to support that leader. The Prime Minister's seat is probably more precarious, more of a hot seat in the British system than in ours, where one can wash one's

*Government Orders*

hands by telling the caucus: “You did not elect me”. In fact, under our election law, the Prime Minister can even designate candidates himself, over-ruling the electoral conventions in the various ridings.

Imagine all the power in the hands of just one person. That person appoints cabinet members, ultimately decides who gets the top jobs in the public service, decides who is appointed to the bench, as well as who can run under the party’s banner. That is a lot of power in the hands of just one person.

The time has come for a major review. I am not sure if the hon. member for Saint-Léonard was being ironic earlier when he referred to the important role of parliamentarians. Let us not forget that never before was Parliament controlled to such an extent by the executive level.

(1640)

When we voted on Bill C-68, three Liberal members opposed the legislation, thus breaking ranks with their government colleagues. All three lost the positions which they held in parliamentary committees. And the member for Saint-Léonard has the nerve to tell us that we must respect the parliamentary institution. Was that institution respected then? We have to wonder.

True control is not exercised by MPs. If the government wants to give some control to members, it must first get rid of the executive level in this House. We do not need it here; let it go to Rideau Hall or on Sussex Drive, if there is room. It is quite possible to change the system so that a member’s ultimate goal, his or her greatest ambition, will be to be the best possible member. There should be no incentive to eventually become a parliamentary secretary or a minister. Members in this House should have no ambition other than to be able to say: I was the best possible member for my riding. The prospect of future promotions should not be a factor.

Those who want to serve at the executive level can certainly do so. However, let us be careful not to mix the two levels, particularly in this House. We all know the perverse effects of this confusion between the legislative and the executive levels. It is high time we distanced ourselves and shifted more toward a congressional type of decision, adapting it, of course, to our way of thinking, to our practices and to our traditions by regulating the activities of lobbyists, the influence peddlars, in order to control them.

The real issue is not members’ powers or conflict of interest. We already have Standing Order 21, which provides the following, and, with your permission, I will quote it:

No member is entitled to vote upon any question in which he or she has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any Member so interested will be disallowed.

The criterion is there; it is basic. When problems arise, we have the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, previously the committee on privileges and elections, which is empowered to hear all matters that may arise pertaining to a member’s status or conflict of interest.

The committee has only to exercise its powers. Nothing is stopping it. If problems are brought to the attention of colleagues in the House, they may be raised, and the Speaker may determine *prima facie* that there is justification for their referral to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The mechanisms are already in place. Why create more? It would probably be enough to have something more flexible at the level of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs so we could have our committee on the rules of ethics in order to improve our operations. It would be much wiser and better advised to control the goings-on in the Prime Minister’s office.

The government is currently behaving like Nero. Legend has it that Nero played his fiddle while Rome burned down. Similarly, while the government fails to follow its own policies on ethical conduct, while the Prime Minister himself tells us that he did not consult his ethics counsellor before taking certain decisions, we are being told that parliamentarians must be watched.

But let us avoid diversion. Diversion may be a very useful tactic in a hockey game during the last few minutes of third period, in order to stop the opponent from scoring a goal. In politics though, diversion tactics should not be overused. I think that we have gone a little too far. Recent cases like that of DirecTV show that mere parliamentarians are not the ones intervening to change decisions. Obviously, people from outside the House are making direct representations to either the Prime Minister’s office or to the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Let us start by really enforcing a code of conduct throughout government, at the ministerial and the executive level. Then it will undoubtedly be time to examine the ethics of the members of this House, the legislative branch of our constitution.

(1645)

[*English*]

**Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very attentively to the comments of the hon. member for Bellechasse.

I have some difficulty with the reluctance of his party to include the upper house in the debate. It concerns me because I think it concerns the people of Canada. There is a lot of reflection on what is happening in the Senate and if taxpayers’ money is being properly spent.

One of the areas of expenditure is the Senate, the senators and their staffs. I have some misgivings about the Senate. It appears

*Government Orders*

to me that at the present time we are not going to be able to deal with reconstituting that place. However, this provides us with an opportunity to revisit possibly the attendance of senators and how they are carrying out their affairs.

The proposal the government presented today provides us with an avenue to revisit that. Could the member reflect on the fact that there may be a high degree of merit in including the senators in this legislation?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Langlois:** Mr. Speaker, in responding to the hon. member for Durham, I would like to remind him of what I said earlier. If the government had wanted the senators to be involved, it would have tabled a bill that would necessarily have been considered in this House and then have gone to the Senate. That was the best way to involve both Houses.

When the government does not want a bill but simply wants to create one more task force, one too many, my position is: Let us create a committee of members of this House, a committee of elected representatives. We should not mix elected representatives with those who are not elected, people who have to go before the electorate every four or five years with those who never have to run on their record. In a democracy, Mr. Speaker, and I say this through you to the hon. member for Durham, in the kind of system we have, a non-elected House where no one is accountable to anyone except to the provisions of the Criminal Code is an anomaly. And that was my message just now.

I realize the hon. member for Durham put a question mark after his comment. He said: Perhaps I did not quite understand? Perhaps I did not get it? I hope that, with this additional information, he will understand that we should not mix elected representatives with non-elected individuals. I am not saying that the Senate should not examine these issues if it wants to. However, the Senate has its own rules, its own board of internal economy which operates differently from ours. Although it does have a budget to administer, it has different rules. We, through our own Board of Internal Economy, set much stricter rules than the Senate does through its board.

My point is, we are constantly putting our seat on the line. Every day, we are accountable to our constituents for what we do. Mixing ingredients that are not terribly compatible to start with, what with Liberal members, members of the Bloc and the Reform Party, and adding a dash of Tory senators to boot, is not really a recipe for success.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Mercier—job creation.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise today to speak to Motion No. 23, that a parliamentary committee draft a code of conduct for MPs and lobbyists, and also support the Bloc amendment.

(1650)

The intention of the motion to reconcile official responsibility with personal interests, including all dealings with lobbyists, is the responsibility of parliamentarians only. Senators, as appointed officials and not elected, should develop their own code of conduct, giving consideration to their current activities with lobbyists.

It is about time. The government ran on a platform that said: “The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable. If government is to play a positive role in society as it must, honesty and integrity in our political institutions must be restored”. That is right out of the Liberal red book.

The record shows that the activities of the government’s ministers and departments subsequent to the election of 1993 have been inconsistent, indecisive and confused, resulting in serious flip-flops in terms of outcome. For a culture to endure and prosper it must safeguard its principles and procedures. Ethics in action will cause that to occur.

I want to focus in particular on the Minister of Canadian Heritage and his record of conduct beginning in March 1994. I do this because it tracks a saga of questionable judgment and inappropriate interference involving four separate incidents. Ethical guidelines provided to him quite likely would have offset the many concerns that have arisen over the grave errors in judgment that have occurred. However, before I do that, consider the following as a frame on which to build an ethical structure.

Public office holders must act with honesty and uphold the highest ethical standards so that public confidence and trust in the integrity, objectivity and impartiality of government are conserved and enhanced. As well, anyone holding public office should not step out of their official roles to assist private entities or persons in their dealings with the government where this would result in preferential treatment to any person.

The issue here is not whether ethical guidelines should become a requirement or wondering if elected federal officials even have a choice any longer in this matter because Canadians expect honesty, integrity and accountability from their politicians.

Clearly the issue is a search for broad, lasting, moral guidelines gleaned from the complex real life ethical situations in politics that are at once imaginative, meaningful and legislatively sound.

*Government Orders*

Anyone who would be ethical has the problem of knowing what his or her standards are. People tend to think of themselves as moral. That they tend to overrate their ethical competence becomes apparent when they find themselves doing the same thing of which they disapprove. Often a substantial gap separates the ethical norms people verbalize and those they use in making their decisions, which tells us more about how ethical a person is.

Verbalization or action? This is a question that Canadians should be asking every time the government makes a decision. Even the Prime Minister has said this is the case, in particular, of ministers who must remain above reproach at all times and in all of their activities, whether it be as ministers, members of Parliament or private citizens. That is the burden of public office and one that we all gladly accept.

I turn my focus to the questionable actions undertaken by the Minister of Canadian Heritage, once again to exemplify this issue of guidelines and standards of ethical behaviour. As I mentioned, four incidents haunt the minister, questioning not only his integrity but also that of the government.

In March 1994 the sale of Ginn Publishing Inc. to American interests evoked outrage on this side of the House. That transaction was the litmus test of the government's commitment to parliamentary reform and to open parliamentary process. The sale should have been investigated but was not. A review should have been undertaken by a parliamentary standing committee but was not. No ethical guidelines were in place at the time to resolve this.

(1655)

I sent a letter to the Prime Minister asking five questions. That letter with those five questions was never acknowledged. I conclude from this that either no one knew how to answer my questions, or if known, there was no desire for full disclosure.

Whatever the case, the only way to get clear answers was for a public investigation because we had no ethical guidelines. Such an investigation would have answered the preceding questions and the five I put to the Prime Minister. I want to repeat these again, because they are important in a discussion of clearly established ethical guidelines.

First, how can the government explain the contradictions evident in the sale with the red book policy on the protection of Canadian art and culture? This is a simple question but there was no response.

Second, how does the government explain the offers to purchase Ginn by several members of the Canadian business community during the period from 1989 to 1994?

Third, what happens to the Canadian publishing industry after February 15, 1999 when Paramount's investment agreement ceases? These are important questions concerning the guidelines we are going to establish hopefully with this parliamentary standing committee.

Fourth, why was a specific job loss figure not included in the press release of February 18, 1994? That is also important, given the considerations that will be coming later. Canadians are still asking questions relating to the Ginn affair because none of this was put to rest.

Fifth, how can the government ignore the provisions of the Investment Canada Act and undertake a private agreement which precludes the sale of a Canadian firm to a foreign company except in extraordinary circumstances?

Over the last couple of weeks we have seen the Investment Canada Act creep up into our problems in the House of Commons. There is no delineation with respect to clearly defined ethical guidelines. How are we going to deal with these matters?

Reform supported the notion of an investigation to allow for freer competition in the Canadian cultural marketplace. The issue was not about protecting Canadian culture from within or from being co-opted by foreign cultural influences from without. It was ethics of procedure, allowing the market to run its due course without needless and harmful protection or undue government regulation. The government should have asked them whether it was the rhetoric or the action that would be remembered.

The ensuing debate should have clarified the minister's involvement but did not. Rather the government invoked closure and thus began to grow a blight on the minister's judgment. What was the ethical criteria on which he made his decisions?

In October 1994 the matter of undue influence from the minister arose over his intervention in a CRTC licence application. Even the Prime Minister at that time admitted his error not only in action but also judgment. This is another example where had ethical guidelines been in place they would have saved us a lot of unnecessary grief.

His actions compromise the integrity of government as well as the CRTC decision making process. As a quasi-judicial body, the CRTC's role remains quite independent of government. The Prime Minister said on October 31, 1994: "When a representation is sent to the CRTC, it is a public document".

From September 1993 to October 1994 the CRTC held 18 public hearings. It received 15,422 letters in support of licence applicants. Seventy-two were from members of Parliament, from all parties in the House. Representations were made by many Liberal members, including ministers, members of the Bloc Quebecois, the Reform Party, the NDP, the Conservatives and one independent. I raise that as an issue because nobody had any guidelines. Of the 15,422 letters that were in support of licence applicants there were no guidelines with which to deal with the matter.

*Government Orders*

The Prime Minister went on to say: "Clearly we are not confronted with anything like calling a judge. What we are dealing with is the dilemma of ministers who also must fulfil their duties as members of Parliament who were elected to represent their constituents. That makes this whole area of relationships with administrative tribunals much more complex than with the courts". The Prime Minister also said: "I have learned a lesson too. This government has done a lot to give our ministers clear guidelines to do their jobs and avoid conflict of interest, including the historical ethics package we introduced in June. It is now plain to me that the guidelines for dealing with administrative tribunals were not clear or complete enough".

(1700)

Even back then the Prime Minister recognized the need for ethical guidelines. This was in response to the questionable actions of the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Although we have an ethics counsellor to assist the Prime Minister in ethical matters, there has been little to suggest guidelines of any consequence are providing complete direction to the Minister of Canadian Heritage or any of the cabinet for that matter.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage obviously and flagrantly breached judicial principles in this instance. The blight on the minister's ethical record continued to grow. Again, what was the ethical criteria on which he made his decision?

The third fiasco involving the minister saw the resignation of the president of the CBC. No longer able to accept the lack of full disclosure regarding the CBC's future, Tony Manera left his post. A secret meeting between CBC and the heritage ministry, denied many times by the minister, revealed financial information which had not appeared in the government's just released budget or in the estimates. The minister's waspish reply to questions in the House became mired in personal cheap shots and innuendo.

In question period on March 1, 1995 I said: "The minister had a secret agenda about the future of the CBC which he had failed to disclose. Why has the minister failed to provide this information to Canadians?" In his response he said: "Mr. Speaker, our colleague is out of luck. Her assistant is no better as a researcher than he was as a candidate in Ottawa—Vanier".

Clearly initiated by the pressure he felt, he resorted to tactics counter to the red book promise of openness and fair play in order for Canadians to regain their trust in the parliamentary system and in their politicians. Cheap shots, no ethical guidelines to provide assistance to the minister. The blight now was of odious proportions.

We now come to the minister's current disasters: the challenge mounted by cabinet to overturn the CRTC's decision to give a licensing exemption to open up satellite distribution in Canada using a Canadian satellite system; and the perception of undue influence and interference regarding the approval of Investment Canada for the purpose of MCA by the Bronfmans, who own Seagram.

Lunching with the players in Los Angeles represents yet another grave error in judgment by the minister. There is no one who can tell me an invitation to the executive suites of MCA is not as a result of considerable effort, not just a little R and R for the minister at spring break as has been suggested.

Of an even more critical nature is government interference under the guise of competition playing business favouritism. As the cabinet sat around the table making a decision that favoured Power Corp. no one seemed conscious of the confrontation that would develop with the direct to home Canadian consortium of Expressvu Inc. which also just happens to have a close relationship with the CRTC.

What I am trying to point out here is the absolute imperative need for ethical guidelines for all of us in the House in order to operate professionally, ethically and morally as representatives of the Canadian people.

Both the reputation and credibility of the Minister of Canadian Heritage are in shreds. It is remarkable that the rhetoric of the Liberal red book has become meaningless and trite babble.

The people of Canada demonstrated their irritation with politicians in government in the last election. They threw out those who did not consult them, who disregarded their views and who tried to conduct key parts of public business behind closed doors.

Let us ensure the deliberations of this standing committee include ordinary Canadians in the process. We need to create a truly representative government in which the wisdom of the people is respected and protected. No one would be well served if the constituents we serve are not included. We all risk a further loss of public regard.

(1705)

Ethical standards emerge from the value we place on ourselves. If the government begins to proactively organize and execute around our priorities, politicians will become known for making and keeping meaningful promises and commitments. Canadians are waiting for that.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member. In her speech she indicated she was supporting the Bloc amendment which would delete any reference to the Senate in the motion. She appears to treat senators as non-parliamentarians by saying only



*Government Orders*

elected members of Parliament are entitled to participate in this process and only they should be subject to guidelines.

Is she suggesting the members of the other place ought to have no guidelines if the House of Commons adopts guidelines? Therefore does she feel it is fair that members of the House should be subject to certain guidelines where members of the other place are free to carry on businesses, trades or do whatever they wish? Is that the position of her party?

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I believe I qualified that in the first sentences of my presentation when I expressed that senators are appointed officials. They are not elected and as a result should develop their own code of conduct.

We ran on the platform that we wanted to see incredible change to the Senate. We believe in a Senate that is equal, effective but elected. It is on the position of being elected that the senators as appointed officials need to develop their own guidelines because they involve their activities in a different way with lobbyists compared with parliamentarians. At least one would hope with the result of these new guidelines that will happen.

That is a question almost irrelevant when we are looking at comparisons between parliamentarians who are elected by the people of Canada and senatorial positions, most of which are patronage appointments with very strong links to the government of the day.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in her remarks indicated there were no guidelines in place. Is she aware that there is a set of conflict of interest guidelines that apply to ministers of the crown and to parliamentary secretaries in the House? Has she seen the document? If not, I would be pleased to send her a copy.

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to receive the document, but to date the actions of the government show it also has not read the document.

**Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very intently to the member for Calgary Southeast.

I thought her party, which seems to be so interested in government financing and the cost of government, would want to have the opportunity to focus on the area of how individual senators perform and whether Canadians are getting value for their money. I am mystified by that stand.

The member went on to discuss ethics and so forth. A great halo comes from that side of the room. I wonder if she could say how ethical it was to be discussing Motion No. 24 which deals with a very specific aspect of ethics and conduct for members of Parliament and senators while using the time almost entirely to

develop a political speech to chastise the government? In my mind she has not added anything very positive to the debate.

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member, I do not believe he heard me very well if he did not think I had anything very positive to add to the debate. I was trying to establish a basis on which ethical criteria are established.

There are four things I believe that go through the mind of an individual when they are looking at an issue of an ethical nature. When people come to a make a decision on a problem they know what people say they should do to resolve the issue. They know there are people who do things as they say they will. Actually when it comes right down to it, the actions of people sometimes are not really what they said they would do. Oftentimes people would like to take an action but do not or cannot for whatever reason. Those were the elements which I tried to bring to the speech.

(1710)

As far as the issue of the Senate, I have stated already the Senate is a house of patronage. It is a house that deals quite specifically with lobbyists in a different way from the House of Commons. Senators are not elected officials and therefore I believe should stand on their own merit and develop their own code of conduct. They are all big boys and girls over there and they should be able to take due consideration with respect to their own activities without our telling them what they should do.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to speak to this motion. I congratulate the government for initiating action with regard to a code of conduct for parliamentarians. If history teaches us anything it is that the House needs to be aware of the need for a code of conduct. It needs to be aware that Canadians expect ethical behaviour from us. My hope is a code will be developed and that it will be effective. I hope it will have some real teeth, not like the ethics counsellor who we saw the Prime Minister appoint, and not some watered down list of suggestions which will have as its only purpose a public relations exercise of so-called government action on ethics.

I am concerned because of the government's failure to carry through on any of its red book promises for a more open and ethical government. While the concept of a code of conduct to guide members in their dealings with lobbyists is a good idea, I have some serious doubts as to the government's willingness to follow through with effective guidelines.

Let us take, for example, the position of the ethics counsellor. Rather than having an independent counsellor accountable to Parliament, as the red book said, the Prime Minister has decided to keep the issue of ethics in house, behind closed doors. By only

*Government Orders*

reporting to the Prime Minister the ethics counsellor has lost the appearance of independence and objectivity. This restriction was underscored during the debacle over the Minister of Canadian Heritage's interference with the CRTC.

There are precedents for positions such as the ethics counsellor to be officers of the House of Commons. The human rights commissioner, the chief electoral officer, the auditor general and the privacy commissioner are all answerable to the House, not to the government. They are not answerable to cabinet or to the Prime Minister; they are answerable to the House. That is important.

In each case it is clear an arm's length relationship with the government is required for those officers to objectively and adequately discharge their responsibilities. The same is true for the ethics counsellor and for any type of code of conduct for parliamentarians.

My concern is that the government wanted to give the impression of ethics without actually changing anything. That is the only reason I can see for not making the ethics counsellor an officer of Parliament. It is a very select group. It is not as though there is no room for change any more. Being an independent officer of the House would allow the ethics counsellor to promote the ethical conduct of members of the House instead of its current position of being a political lap-dog of the Prime Minister.

Despite all the rhetoric about open government and more independence for backbenchers the government has continued the tradition of secrecy and whipping members into line. I have seen many government members speak in favour of some of the ideas expressed on this side of the House only to withdraw and toe the party line when their voice really counted, when they stood up in the House to vote, when they voted in committee or when they had to sign on to committee reports. That is not active and quality democracy and that is not representative democracy.

Our debates in the Chamber on gun control are a good example of how the government really feels about open government. When some of its members chose out of good conscience to represent their constituents rather than do the bidding of the party hierarchy they were reprimanded. Imagine that. They were reprimanded for daring to do the bidding of the constituents who sent us here, who pay the bills, who pay our salaries and who even pay for our pensions.

(1715)

These are the reasons I am concerned that this code of conduct must be carefully and properly crafted. This government does not have a good track record of being proactive on ethical matters. If we can draft a good code of conduct, it may add some much needed legitimacy to the ethics counsellor.

The importance of having this kind of code of conduct cannot be overemphasized. This government obviously needs some guidelines when it comes to ethical dealings with lobbyists. The whole Pearson scandal is the best example of closed door unethical activity. This deal was started by the previous Tory government and the closed door antics have been continued by this government.

There is the whole issue of José Perez and his dealings with Senator De Bané and Canada Post. As well, the Minister of Canadian Heritage has had questionable dealings with the CRTC in the past and is under a cloud of suspicion once again.

The need for this kind of a code of conduct is self-evident. I only hope the Liberals have the political courage to put aside their self-interests and the interests of their well-connected friends and family members to draft an effective and complete code.

While having a committee draft this code is an improvement over the usual closed door cabinet process, I have some concerns about the make-up of the committee. I do not believe that senators should be included on a House of Commons committee. Let me take a few minutes to tell this House why I have some concerns.

Having senators involved with drafting a code of conduct dealing with issues like conflict of interest is a bit like having the inmates running the asylum. It is a bit like putting violent offenders on the parole board. It just does not make sense. I do not understand why this Liberal government would promote such a ridiculous idea.

I will not make these suggestions without backing them up with facts. Not very many years ago, a Prime Minister by the name of Mulroney stacked the Senate with eight senators. Why did he do that? To put through the GST.

What would happen if some of those senators who agreed to accept those extra positions above the 104 senators ended up on this ethics committee? I am a bit concerned about that. What if the Hon. Eric Berntson from Saskatchewan, one of the stacked senators, ended up on this ethics committee? He was the one who said: "I will never accept a government appointment. I refuse any government appointments". A week or two later when Brian Mulroney asked if he would take a Senate seat to help him get the GST through, he said: "Yes, I would love to sit in the Senate. The rest of my life will be cushy. I will do that for you". The Liberal government defends that type of action and I am shocked.

There was another member in that group of select senators. They had to put stacking chairs in the Senate to accommodate these extra senators. His name was the Hon. John Buchanan. He was considered to be the most efficient bagmen in all of Atlantic Canada. Is this the type of person we want to allow to sit on a committee to discuss a code of conduct and to consider conflict of interest? I am shocked that the Liberals would suggest and promote such an idea.

*Government Orders*

There are a couple of other people who sit over in the other place: the Hon. Guy Charbonneau and the Hon. Michel Cogger. Their names were in the news for a long time. I remember reading about them in almost every chapter of Stevie Cameron's book *On the Take*.

Are these the kinds of people the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands wants to see sitting on a committee to draft a code of conduct for parliamentarians? Perhaps they may be the result of an investigation rather than the ones who are drafting the code. The Liberals are putting forward a motion in this House which would allow them to sit on this committee. I am shocked. I would ask the Liberals to withdraw the motion, come to their senses and realize what they are doing.

There is another potential candidate for this committee. Her name is Marjory LeBreton. She was the director of Tory patronage, the one who decided which Tories got put in which position of patronage. She probably even had a hand in determining who Brian Mulroney would place in the Senate. Perhaps she had a hand in choosing the six senators to sit on those six stacking stools that the Minister of Transport has correctly identified. Would the Minister of Transport agree to have Marjory LeBreton sitting on a code of conduct committee? This motion would allow that to happen. I am shocked.

There is another one over there, Pierre Claude Nolin. He was Brian Mulroney's crony in Quebec, his principal adviser in the province of Quebec. He accepted his appointment right at the tail end of the Mulroney era, when the whole country was angry at Brian Mulroney and his government and the people wanted to kick them out.

(1720)

**An hon. member:** Who was that?

**Mr. Hermanson:** The Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin was appointed. I think it was in June 1993 that he accepted his appointment.

Do we want somebody, a friend of a government Canadian considered to be villainous to be sitting on the committee for the code of conduct, to be determining the code of ethics we should be living by? I am shocked. I can hardly believe it.

There is someone else who might happen to be involved in the committee and who happens to be a Liberal, the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen. He is considered to be the godfather of the Liberals in Atlantic Canada. He has a reputation that one member on the front bench is trying to emulate.

There is an article in *Maclean's* which says: "Then comes the minister of public works, a show stopper. The incantatory, drawn out delivery of Allan J. MacEachen, the long time federal

Liberal minister from Cape Breton who now sits in the Senate. "Close your eyes", says one of the acquaintances of both men, "and you will swear Allan J. is right there in the room". There is only one Allan J, the minister explains with an annoying chuckle.

Then it goes on to talk about how Hon. Allan J. MacEachen was a godfather in Atlantic Canada and certainly someone involved in patronage. Certainly, he is someone that we would not want on a committee to discuss and draft a code of ethics for parliamentarians, but this is what the Liberals are intending to do.

There is another problem with this committee. Right now the Senate is controlled by the Tories. I understand that the Prime Minister is working overtime to install his own hacks. The Minister of Transport knows that the Senate is controlled by the Tories. He is having some problems with the Pearson airport affair.

The Tories are also worried. A few hundred of them met across the river over the weekend. They were planning strategy. Their strategy was: "How do we get back on the gravy train? We are not getting many appointments to the Senate anymore and we miss that". They are strategizing how to get back into government so they can get back on the gravy train and see some of their own appointed to the Senate.

Too many of the old Mulroney gang had their eyes on a red covered chair in the Senate. And these are the people we want to be involved in drafting a code of ethics for us, for the elected members of the House of Commons? I think not. Some code of conduct that might be.

The group of Tories that met in Hull over the weekend did not apologize to Canadians for the despicable things they did when they were in power. They should have. They did not apologize to Canadians for increasing our debt from about \$200 billion to over \$400 billion. They never said they were sorry. And these are the kind of people the Liberals want to put on an ethics committee? I think not.

The Tories imposed the GST on Canadians against their will and they had to stack the Senate to do it. These are the kinds of people we want to put on an ethics committee?

The Tories, along with the Liberals, were involved in drafting the Charlottetown accord, the infamous accord that had some terrible things in it. One item in the Charlottetown accord called for a double majority in the Senate regarding votes on matters respecting language and culture. That meant that if there was an issue that addressed language or culture, not only did the majority of senators have to vote in favour of the measure, but a majority of francophone senators had to vote in favour of it. That is not democratic.

*Government Orders*

It is not democratic that they are unelected, but then they get a double majority based on language and ethnic origin? That is disgusting. Yet the people over there want these types of people to sit on an ethics committee. I am astounded. I cannot believe it.

The Charlottetown accord said that this new Senate would be elected. Members on the other side brought that to our attention. Of course we knew it would be elected, but who wants that type of an elected Senate? What decent person would run for election to that kind of a Senate? I do not think we would find very many good candidates that would agree to sit in a body that would use a double majority on votes relating to language and culture. That is disgusting. It is not Canadian and it is not true democracy. Yet the Liberals want these kinds of people to sit on a committee to draft a code of conduct for parliamentarians.

(1725)

The Tories never apologized for doing these things. The Liberals have not apologized for their role in the Charlottetown accord, although there were two or three of them who I think did see the light and spoke against the accord. The majority as usual followed like sheep to the slaughter and lost the Charlottetown accord.

Canadians are not as thoughtless as many members on the other side might think. They see through these things and were appalled at the Charlottetown accord. They were appalled at the debt the Tories built up. They said it was immoral, that it was wrong. Because of that they only elected two Tory members to the House in the last election. They said that the GST was wrong as well. When two or three Tories stood up and said they would not vote for the GST, they were disciplined just like the Liberals were who voted against the gun control measure. Nothing is different between the Liberals and the Tories. They stand for the same principles. Did I say principles? I do not think they stand for any principles. It is disgusting.

These people want to draft a code of conduct, a code of ethics for parliamentarians? I think not.

The Senate certainly needs a code of conduct. The member for Kingston and the Islands has talked about it. Do they not want senators to have a code of conduct? Do they not want them to be accountable? The first thing is that they need to be accountable to the people of Canada. Until we change the Constitution that will not happen. Perhaps rather than abolishing the Senate we should be talking about abolishing the appointed senators. That might be a move in the right direction.

I have spoken at some length on this matter and will conclude before my time runs out. I want to clearly say to the House that we do need a code of conduct. We do need to know how to deal with lobbyists. That is important. However, we certainly do not want direction from the old Tory gang. That would be a disaster. That is far less than Canadians deserve in this place. We must

not support a joint committee to deal with the issue of ethics and a code of conduct.

Perhaps the Liberals have seen the error of their ways. I know they did quite a bit of yelling over there because they have been told they have to support this motion. It is government policy and they have no choice. However, they should just step back for a minute and think logically about what they are doing. They are supporting the old Tory ways. They are not being any different.

There are several new MPs over on the other side who have not been tainted with that Tory-Liberal past of previous Parliaments. Perhaps this is the time for them to stand up and be counted and vote against something that is not right. Let them do something right for a change, not just for themselves, not just for the Liberal Party, not just for the House of Commons, but for Canadians.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Call in the members.

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until tomorrow at 5.30 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

\* \* \*

(1730)

**LOBBYISTS REGISTRATION ACT**

The House resumed from April 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-43, an act to amend the Lobbyists Registration Act and to make related amendments to other acts, be read the third time and passed.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak today in opposition to the Lobbyists Registration Act.

When American President Calvin Coolidge was governor of Massachusetts prior to becoming president, the local Polish community wanted him to appoint one of theirs as a judge. There was one lady in particular, a lobbyist, who came to see the president on a regular basis. She pestered him again and again but she could not get him to make the appointment. She showed up at his office on a regular basis and could not get him to make this appointment. Finally an entire delegation of notables descended on him in his office. They came to see him to try to persuade Mr. Coolidge to make this appointment.

When they arrived at his office, Mr. Coolidge sat and stared at the floor. After an uncomfortable silence he said "New carpet". The whole delegation hastily agreed it was a wonderfully new carpet and that he had gotten his money's worth. After a while he said "It cost a lot of money". The delegation again assured him that it was a very beautiful carpet and that indeed he had gotten his money's worth. Finally he looked up at them and said "She wore out the old one trying to get you that judge". They left.

The same Calvin Coolidge wrote in his memoirs that when one is in politics, nine out of ten people who come to lobby you want something they ought not to have. "If you just ignore them", he said, "after three or four minutes they will run out of things to say and they will leave".

If Mr. Coolidge were still in office, we might not need to register lobbyists. We might not need this act. If Mr. Coolidge were still in office, we might not need an ethics counsellor. Old Silent Cal was his own ethics counsellor, and he sure knew how to deal with lobbyists.

Calvin Coolidge did not think that it was the business of government to seize property from the average citizen and redistribute it to the shrill. Unfortunately—I say that judiciously—we have made much progress since then. Now our governments dispose of huge sums of money. Our federal government spends \$160 billion a year, and that means that anyone can get very rich on even a small amount of it if they manage to persuade government to dole out the favours.

There are a lot more plums to be shaken from the tree of government. Our governments now relentlessly regulate the economy. If you can get a regulation changed in your favour it means more to you than making a better mouse trap, hiring a better employee, or finding a new and better way of doing an old task. We have seen that with the recent changes to TV regulations. Even when the policy change is a good one, we have to worry about how it was done. Government simply has too many favours at its disposal.

When people lobby government, they almost invariably want something they can get by going to Canadians and asking them for it. They can come to my house and ask me for donations for the various enterprises for which they are looking for funding. They can go to other Canadians, but most Canadians probably would tell them to go play in traffic. What do they do? They come to Ottawa to lobby government for the funds they are looking for.

If we substitute the word "force" for the word "government", we can see how government can achieve what these people are looking for, because government has the means and the power to force people to give up part of their incomes through taxation and take that money and redistribute it to these people who come lobbying in Ottawa.

We have swarms of lobbyists trying to influence government. That means we need laws to regulate them. Unfortunately, this bill does not do the job. This bill does not define lobbying strictly enough and enables people to lobby in everything but name.

It is even worse when we come to ethics counsellors. It is a shame that we need them. I would much rather have politicians who know right from wrong. I lament the day that we went from morals to ethics. It has all been downhill ever since.

(1735)

If we are to have an ethics counsellor, let us have one with some independence. Let us have the ethics counsellor who is described in the red book, who reports directly to Parliament. Let us have an ethics counsellor who can tell the Prime Minister "No, you are wrong", without fear of getting fired from his job. Let us try to swat the swarm of flies buzzing around Parliament Hill picking up scraps off a bloated budget and carrying them off.

Let us not forget that the reason we have people seeking unseemly favours from government in unseemly ways is that government has become too big. Let us not forget that government has the power to reward friends and supplicants in a way it simply should not. Let us work on putting government back in its box.

Let us remember that if men were devils government would not be possible, but if they were angels it would not be necessary. Let us remember that political philosophy should be occupied not with the question "Who gets to the front of the trough?", but with the question "How can government be strong enough to protect the lives, liberties, and property of its citizens without being strong enough to menace them?" Then we would not have to worry about who the cabinet is meeting with today, who the Prime Minister is related to, or any other questions. That would be real lobbying and ethics reform.

Let us defeat Bill C-43 and get on with that.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise to speak in support of Bill C-43, as amended.

The Lobbyists Registration Act is one more initiative of the government to help ensure honesty and integrity in the politics of governance, a key plank in the Liberal platform as laid out in our red book. I am glad to note that members opposite have also found this book to be a valuable reference.

At this juncture allow me to congratulate the members of the Standing Committee on Industry, under the able leadership of its chairman, the hon. member for Fundy—Royal, for its excellent and timely report, appropriately entitled “Rebuilding Trust”.

It was my privilege to have contributed in some small measure to the deliberations of this committee. It was evident then, and my initial impression has since been reinforced by the report, that the committee, composed of members from all political parties, would leave no stone unturned in its effort to report a bill that would ensure that present and future governments will remain honest, open, and accountable. Citizens expect no less.

I indicated earlier that the report’s title, “Rebuilding Trust”, is most appropriate and timely. Until the last federal election there was an unprecedented level of public cynicism about our national institutions and the political process, about Parliament itself. Citizens saw their system eroded, serving the servants and not the public. That is why integrity in government was a major Liberal platform in 1993.

Keeping his promise, the Prime Minister restated in leading the debate in this House on Bill C-43 that his highest priority was restoring Canadians’ faith in their institutions. He reasoned that cynicism ultimately undermines the proper functioning of Canada, eroding our national resolve to work for a better nation. The Prime Minister with these remarks was acknowledging the central role public trust plays in the success of any government, and we all share in this.

Canadians will recall that early in the mandate of this government the EH helicopter contract was cancelled at once, as promised. A \$6 billion national infrastructure works program, in concert with the provinces and municipalities, was immediately put in place, as promised. The preceding and the last budgets are on track to reduce Canada’s deficit to 3 per cent of the gross domestic product, as promised. Overfishing by foreign fleets, which threatened our already scarce domestic stocks, has been stopped, as promised.

(1740)

Last but not least, a new Canada health and social transfer program to govern future provincial–federal transfers has been

announced to ensure the preservation and strengthening of medicare, as promised.

We have shown Canadians that integrity cannot be preserved simply by paying it lip service. It must take the form of clear, decisive action. Integrity must become a way of public service, a habit of the heart on the part of any government. The Liberal government since assuming office has sent out a strong and clear message that the integrity of our country’s institutions is not for sale.

The government and Parliament will serve all Canadians. Bill C-43 is one more indisputable proof of that resolve on the part of this government.

How will Bill C-43 restore and reaffirm public trust in the integrity of our national institutions? There are several ways. By appointing an ethics counsellor, by empowering the ethics counsellor to develop a code of conduct for lobbyists, and by ensuring that lobbyists will have a legal obligation to comply with the code, we can assure Canadians of integrity in our national institutions and therefore regain their trust.

By insisting that a code of conduct will have to be reviewed by a parliamentary committee before it comes into full effect, we can ensure that all political perspectives will have input into the substance of the code. By requiring that the ethics counsellor must investigate breaches of the code and submit a detailed report of each investigation to Parliament, we can ensure there will not be a whitewash. By ensuring that the ethics counsellor reports to Parliament annually, we can ensure there will be ongoing vigilance.

Some members opposite have argued that the code of conduct as proposed is not a regulatory text and not enforceable in law. There is a far greater document than law. Codes of conduct of various professional societies and trades have proven to be effective tools in ensuring exemplary conduct on the part of their members. I am confident that elected officials will rise to the challenge called for by the new code of conduct.

Some members opposite have also argued that appointment of the ethics counsellor by the governor in council is not too independent a process. I remind the members opposite have far greater faith in the integrity of our citizens, in the integrity of our appointees, in the integrity of our officials who assume office through the appointment process. One classic example is that of our judiciary system. Our Supreme Court is one such shining example.

The process of assuming office is not as critical as the integrity of the people who have assumed office. Let us not prejudice the integrity of our ethics counsellor.

Other colleagues from the government side have already spoken on the many other positive aspects of Bill C-43, in-

*Government Orders*

cluding the area of disclosure. There will be disclosure of fees and disclosure of government funding for associations.

Allow me to recall once more for my colleagues opposite and for all colleagues in the House that we have gone a long way since 1993 in terms of the rebuilding of public trust. The mood of Canadians has greatly changed, from cynicism in 1993 to optimism today.

The Canadian people have placed their trust in the Liberal government. I am honoured to serve with the government. Not only has it restored economic life, not only has it reduced the federal deficit, not only has it created jobs, not only has it restored public institutions and infrastructures, this government has also restored integrity in governance.

Integrity is once again a way of public service, and we have all benefited from this change. Parliament is the highest court in the land where the voices of Canadians, rich and poor, men and women, young and old, are heard and given equal strength.

(1745)

It is said that members of Parliament should reflect the fears and hopes of their constituents today and in the future. I agree and we agree. I also say that we must reflect the hopes of our constituents of yesterday whose time honoured values include integrity, which continues to guide decisions we make today.

I am delighted to support Bill C-43 which marks the dawn of a renewed era in Canadian politics, integrity in governance, and thereby restore the nobility of our chosen profession in the House.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my intervention will be more a comment than a question, although I am sure the member will want to respond to it.

He indicated that we have spoken about the lack of independence of the counsellor. Then he went on to say that he had more faith in these people than that. So do we. That is why I think the process, as defined, is so very unfortunate.

The person in the position right now is an honourable person. It certainly is not a goal of mine to see if I can find where someone has made an error. That is not my goal. I have not found anything on him. I do not think there is anything of a serious nature or anything at all.

He is a man of integrity. He is a man that can be trusted. Unfortunately, because he is appointed by the Prime Minister, because he answers to the Prime Minister and because there is no independence from that particular role, the individual can be as honest and as clean as the day is long but he will not be able authentically to convince Canadian people of it. Try as he might, because of that close relationship there will always be people

who have not forgotten the previous government, even on the assumption that there is nothing wrong with the government. I do not buy that, by the way. Everyone has problems from time to time.

When we form the government next time I am sure there will be allegations made about us. That is when I want the ethics counsellor to be independent. When false allegations are made the person who makes an investigation and reports on them must be truly seen to be independent so that he is trusted. Then when he says there is nothing wrong it will be taken as a true statement instead of one that is manipulated. That is why we are saying that the ethics counsellor should be totally independent from cabinet and from the Prime Minister.

The added problem in Bill C-43 is that both the ethics counsellor and the registrar report through the minister. There have been comments on that point: "What is wrong with that? Don't we trust our ministers?" Yes, we do, but if there is a true or false allegation against any minister, particularly the minister who will act as registrar general, the case is totally weakened by the fact that he would bring forward the report on himself. No one would believe it and it might be totally true. That is what is so unfortunate.

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, the conclusion in his comments was that anything via the appointment process is inherently bad and that anything by election is inherently good. Otherwise he would not have made a comment.

Sad as it may be, even some elected members of Parliament have been corrupt in the past so an election is no guarantee. We need citizens who will serve the country with integrity.

(1750)

The justices of the Supreme Court have been appointed to office but have retained their independence. The independence of an official is not related to the process; it is related to the soul of the individual. If the member were to be appointed by the government to an office in the future, he would think just as independently as anyone would.

The appointment process does not in any way take away from the true independence of the appointed Canadian citizen. I have faith in our citizenry.

Also in the bill is the area of public scrutiny, scrutiny by the highest court of the land, by the House, when allegations can be substantiated to show the disappearance of independence on the part of the appointee. Then members of Parliament have an obligation to point it out to the Canadian public.

I am not afraid of the appointment process. I would like my colleagues to have more faith in our officials. Appointment as a

*Government Orders*

process is not the only answer. We need officials with the highest level of integrity. I am convinced the government with its bill and commitment to keep its promises has already shown the Canadian public it is serious about integrity. I would like my colleague to have faith in us.

**Mr. Epp:** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague across the way missed the point. It is not that I do not have faith. Those of us within these walls have a high level of faith in one another across party lines. I do. I look at Liberal members and I do not see any reason to accuse them wholesale of wanting somehow to deceive the public. I do not observe that. From time to time allegations are made. I am not the one who has to have faith; it is the Canadian people.

Why was this section included in the red book if it was not as a response to the lack of faith Canadians have developed over the last number of years? I am sure they would be happiest if we said over the previous nine years before the last election. There is no doubt that Canadians in general have lost a lot of faith in government officials because of things that have gone on, things that have been exposed and things that have been wrong.

We need an ethics counsellor who is independent and is seen to be independent by the public so that he has real credibility when he makes the pronouncement that it is an innocent case. He should have total freedom and not in any way be perceived to be under any pressure from the Prime Minister or any cabinet minister when he is conducting an investigation so that he will be believed regardless of how he calls the investigation.

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, how can the member say he has faith in the ethics counsellor at the same time as he says the person could be manipulated and his report may not be believed because he has been appointed to that office? How can we believe the member has complete faith in the person when at the same time he would say that the person can be manipulated?

(1755)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, with Bill C-43, the Liberal government has as usual ignored the real problems.

With this bill to amend the Lobbyists Registration Act and to make related amendments to other acts, the government has not resolved anything. What this Parliament needs is not another bill but above all a code of conduct for lobby groups, which wield excessive powers in this country.

To go on and conclude that lobbyists are leading the country seems to be the logical step. True enough. We know that lobbying activities have always been part of the Canadian political scene. Over the years, these activities have become an important component of the political process. Between 1969 and 1985, some 20 private members' bills dealing with this issue were tabled in the House of Commons.

All these bills were motivated by the same reason, the same need, the same desire, that is, to make the government more open and democratic. The fact that we are being asked to address this issue again today means that we have not made as much progress as we hoped.

As I read this bill, it occurred to me that, between the time when election promises were made and the time when they were put into law, lobbyists probably dictated the final version of Bill C-43, which would account for this abrupt turnaround in Liberal policy. I would like to caution this government against dissociating itself from these groups, as we all remember that the Government of Canada started being influenced by lobbyists as far back as 1969, under the Trudeau government, of which the current Prime Minister was an active member.

Let us remember the role played by lobbyists in developing the free trade agreement and the goods and services tax. Remember also the role played by the Business Council on National Issues, the most powerful and active lobby in this country. In fact, to join, you have to be president of one Canada's top 150 corporations. Together, members of this select circle manage \$975 billion and employ 1.5 million Canadians, or 12 per cent of the country's labour force. It is therefore fair to say that this group has power, or a hold, over the government.

We also know that the members of this organization make generous donations to campaign funds, whether Conservative or Liberal. Must I remind members of the influence this group had on the Mulroney government when the Meech agreements were passed in 1990? As members will recall, the Mulroney government had hired Ronald Watts to act as the brain behind the constitutional strategy. But what everyone here may not know is that Mr. Watts was the expert adviser of the Business Council on National Issues at the time. Just think of how much influence he had and was able to bring to bear on the government.

I would even go further and say that the kind of lobbying practised in Canada is causing this country to become dehumanized.

(1800)

In his memoirs, a former Quebec Premier, René Lévesque, refers to a meeting which took place in 1982 with a Bank of Canada official who was obsessed with the fight against inflation, but showed very little concern about unemployment.



*Government Orders*

As you can see, central bank officials change, but their obsession remains the same. Why? Simply because of the lobbyists, whose companies prefer to maintain unemployment high, so as to have access to cheap manpower.

When the party in office claims to want to put people back to work, we have to wonder, since its cannot do anything against powerful lobbies.

This is why members opposite are not so irked by a referendum campaign, since it provides them with an opportunity to avoid the real problems which they cannot solve, such as job creation.

I am only asking the government to fulfil a commitment made last June, when the Prime Minister said that initiatives relating to transparency, including Bill C-43, would give unprecedented transparency to the federal administration. The events of the last 15 days give you an idea of this transparency.

There can be no doubt about the power of lobbyists. According to an article published in a London newspaper in December 1992, there were 149 rich men and women in Canada. These are the people who run the country. These rich men and women are of course the members of the Business Council on National Issues. This is a group which, I say again, makes financial contributions to the Conservative and Liberal parties.

The credibility of the Parliament of Canada is undermined by such headlines. The time has come to act and this is why the Bloc Quebecois is asking that all lobbyists be subjected to the same disclosure rules.

Nobody in this House would be surprised to hear that, as usual, the government, contrary to its red book commitments, even refuses to subject all professional lobbyists, that is those who influence the government for essentially economic reasons, to the same disclosure rules. Why? What is the government's interest? Who is it trying to protect? Who is it trying to please? We hope those questions will be answered.

Obviously, clauses concerning the ethics counsellor need to be closely scrutinized. One of the main functions of the counsellor should be to prepare a code of conduct for lobbyists. Properly designed, that code could increase public awareness of lobbying and reduce improper conduct on the part of lobbyists. I hope that code would have a greater impact than the Lobbyists Registration Act itself.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to what the member opposite had to say. Towards the end of his speech, he indicated that he would like all lobbyists to be subject to the same rules.

(1805)

That would mean for example that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the UPA and the Red Cross would be subject to the same onerous rules as the large lobbying firms set up here, in Ottawa.

I do not know if the member was there when the parliamentary committee considered the bill, but the groups I just mentioned, the Dairy Farmers of Canada, for example, told the committee that the rules should not be the same for them and for the large Canadian lobbying firms.

Can the hon. member tell us why he disagrees with the proposal which was made by the Dairy Farmers of Canada to the parliamentary committee and which the government has implemented?

**Mr. Fillion:** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to answer this question. First of all, lobbying can be divided into two categories. The first category is the kind of lobbying where fundamental problems concerning basic principles are discussed, whether they be moral principles, work principles, or whatever. The other category is the economic lobbying category. These lobbyists are the ones that I am talking about. Just take as an example the events which took place over the last few weeks. Think about Power Corporation and Power DirecTv. These two examples are enough to give the members opposite pause.

I want to add that when we talk about integrity and transparency in this area, we are talking precisely about fiscal integrity and transparency. You organize dinners at \$1,000 a plate. What ordinary citizen can afford a dinner at that price? It is Power Corporation who will buy 10, 15, 20 or 25 tickets at \$1,000 each and give them to their friends. Is that your idea of transparency?

The Bloc Quebecois is simply saying no to that. All we want is to improve the integrity of parliamentarians.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before returning the floor to the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for a supplementary question, I would remind you, dear colleagues, that all remarks must be addressed to the Chair.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, judging by his response, I think the hon. member misunderstood my question. He said in his remarks that all lobbyists—I wrote it down as he went along—that all lobbyists should be subject to the same rules.

In the answer he tried to give us, he acknowledged himself that lobbyists were not all on an equal footing. He said that some people dealing with certain types of matters should, by dint of circumstance, come under stricter rules, if I understood correctly.

I therefore repeat my earlier request. In the bill, the rules governing organizations such as farm federations or similar groups will be less strict. Why does the hon. member want the rules to be just as strict in the case of farm federations and of the

*Government Orders*

Canadian association of dairy producers, which testified before the committee requesting more relaxed rules for its members? Why does he oppose the position of these organizations? I am trying to be clearer than I was the last time.

**Mr. Fillion:** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member opposite understood perfectly the answer I gave earlier. He understood every word, but he chose to interpret it in his own way. However, I do not agree with his interpretation. I do not agree, because once again, the rules must be the same for lobbyists involved in the financial sector.

(1810)

I understand what he is getting at. He would like to stifle the activities of pressure groups as well, but that is not the point. We will not prevent lobbying on issues pertaining to unemployment insurance, student loans and post-secondary education. We will not prevent lobbying in those areas, except in the case of financial lobbyists, when the time comes to pass strict laws that will help the old-time parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives, show a little more integrity and more transparency in their operations.

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague's opinion on lobbying and I realize that lobbying is a legitimate activity. Parties with interests at stake have the right to heighten the awareness of others to them. What is not right is carrying on these representations secretly, furtively, which can in no way serve the public interest.

My colleague mentioned in his speech that the legislative branch, the House of Commons, has a role to play. And I, as an MP—this needs to be said—often get the feeling that outside influences, especially from high finance, force a decision to go a certain way, and they leave no trace leading to the truth or even to information which would shed some light on what is being hidden behind the masks and the empty gestures.

For two weeks, several questions have been asked in this House regarding who is responsible for the satellite broadcasting issue, and, overall, the issue is extremely clouded.

Therefore, we do not want to prohibit lobbying but to make it transparent so that the House can really protect the public's interests.

I would like my honourable colleague to respond to the comments I have just made.

**Mr. Fillion:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity to point out that his comments show that he did not really listen to my speech, but only grasped two or three words from it, on which he based his incomprehensible gibberish that he probably does not even understand himself.

I will quote exactly what I said in my speech: "Nobody in this House would be surprised to hear that, as usual, the government—your Liberal government—contrary to its red book commitments—".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order please. I already took a few moments earlier and I will do it again. I must remind you that, to the greatest extent possible, all statements must be made through the Chair.

**Mr. Fillion:** Mr. Speaker, I will continue quoting from my speech: "—the government, contrary to the red book commitments—I know it is shocking—"refuses that all professional lobbyists, that is to say those who influence the government for purely economic reasons, be made to abide by the same disclosure rules". This is what I said. I was referring to lobbyists whose goals are essentially economic. I differentiate between the two categories. So, when it comes to lobbyists whose goals are essentially economic, their name, interests and rules should be disclosed, just as we, in the Bloc Québécois, are not afraid to publish the list of taxpayers who contribute to our election fund, since we do not accept gifts from companies.

(1815)

*[English]*

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to address Bill C-43, the Lobbyists Registration Act, and to express some of my concerns and frustrations with the continuing saga of the sophistry of the Liberal Party, which is using clever but misleading arguments to encourage and to instil confidence in the Canadian public that what it is doing is in their best interests.

In the long run, at the end of the day and at the end of the term, when we see the results of that party's futile efforts, finally we will see that all the things the Reform Party and a lot of the things the Bloc Québécois are saying about this government will come true. We will see the facts and know that all the sophistry has done nothing but keep the Prime Minister high in the polls.

During the next election I know there will be Liberal members taking pride in initiatives such as this bill and the joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate to establish a code of ethics. They will say the government has restored integrity to the Canadian parliamentary system. They will talk about how they kept all their promises in the Liberal red book, despite the fact that the Reform Party has already pointed out about 20 broken promises.

The Liberals are against recall. They do not want recall. They do not want to have a certain member in their party who has been expelled from caucus; that member is representing over 100,000 people, was elected as a Liberal, and sits in the House as an independent. That should be an embarrassment to Liberals, but they say the best form of recall—and this will come back to haunt them—is at election time. The Prime Minister has said "That is the time when they can vote me out. That is the time

*Government Orders*

when we will be held accountable.” I am here to remind Liberal members that they will be held accountable. The people of Ontario, who voted with their feet the last time, just might vote with their feet again in 1997.

They talk about pension reform, the relaxation of party discipline, open and honest government. Restoring integrity to politicians is what is in the red book. We know politicians have a poor name, probably because of the most immediate past government. Nevertheless, this government is starting to develop that same arrogance, that same defiant way, where its members feel they can do anything they want to do, when they want to do it, how they want to do it, behind closed doors.

For instance, let us look at the incident that is being debated in the House now, with the direct to home satellite service, and the performance of the Minister of Canadian Heritage to date. As we all know, we questioned his judgment and we questioned his competence when he wrote a letter to the CRTC, an agency that is supposed to report to him on an arm's length basis, suggesting that a certain constituent of his receive a radio application. That was a breach of his cabinet oath, yet nothing happened. This was run by the ethics counsellor, who also in the red book, the Prime Minister promised, would answer to Parliament.

I will come back to that issue in a second, because the Reform critic has done an excellent job of pointing out things that he feels should be repeated at this point in time.

This bill talks about elements like integrity and ethics. When we talk about integrity and ethics we have to show transparency, we have to show consistency, and we have to keep our promises.

An order in council came forth this past week saying that we believe in fair and open competition, we believe that Canadians want competition, and we are working in the best interests of Canadians; therefore, Power Corp. should have the right to compete for direct to home satellite services. So be it. If the government was really consistent in its philosophy and if it really had any integrity at all, it would have to be consistent. To be consistent, the government must also revisit the decision of the CRTC, which at this point was consistent in both of its decisions, because it wanted to protect Canadian culture. Both of those decisions were rendered in the name of Canadian culture. One is overturned by an order in council, which is an unprecedented use of power. It is using a sledgehammer when a little hammer would do.

(1820)

What did the government do with the other decision, about the monopoly granted to Rogers cable system, that only Canadian programming would be on there, and the new stations that were

awarded? It excluded the country music cable station from the United States.

If this government really has integrity, if this government has any morals at all, it will be consistent with their order in council on the direct to home television decision and it will have another order in council ordering the CRTC to reverse its decision on Rogers and allow CMT to compete openly with Canadians.

We now have to compete as Canadian football players with Americans in the CFL. We now have free trade. We now have open borders. If we are going to compete, let us compete. Let us not just do it on the basis of keeping it all in the family.

That is what is wrong with this bill, the very thing we are talking about this week, about the transparency of transactions where government gets itself involved with businesses. Power Corporation and those people who are representing the satellite services run a business. They make a profit. They want the government's help. They needed the government's help to come into this picture so that they could compete with Expressvu, which has spent \$200 million. They were using Canadian services, Canadian satellites. The CRTC was consistent, but this government orders an order in council.

We have the right to question that. Did Power Corporation lobby? Was there any company hired to lobby on behalf of Power Corporation? Was there any need for a lobby? Somebody said the Liberal Party is a lobby. I like that line.

Joking aside, if there were a need, how would the Lobbyists Registration Act, Bill C-43, aid, benefit, and help this process and keep it transparent so that the Canadian public does not question the integrity and the ethics of the government politicians?

I want to hold up my Prime Minister and that cabinet in esteem. I want to criticize wrong policies. I never want to have to question their ethics, their morals, or their intent. That is not what we should be here for.

In the way it happened, an order in council, why. On the basis of a three person committee? On that three person committee there was a former law partner of the Prime Minister, an individual who runs a company that is owned by Bronfman, and another individual who was appointed deputy minister by Liberal Prime Minister Trudeau. They were all deputy ministers, I heard somebody say today; I believe it was the government whip. They all were working in the bureaucracy. They got solicitations. They got a hundred or so letters, we were told in answer to a question in question period. Let us make those letters public. Let us find out what those people said before they made their recommendation. We cannot get to the bottom of this.

*Government Orders*

This bill is important. We should have lobbyists register. We should have them register as per what was said in the red book. They are breaking another promise. Where is the ethics and the integrity in breaking another promise?

The positive elements of the bill are that it does increase the disclosure requirements for lobbyists, especially for tier two, in house. Another positive is that any lobbyists whose clients are coalitions will have to disclose the membership for that coalition so that we know exactly the size of the group we are dealing with. It also adds government funding and the subject matter of a lobbying proposal to disclosure requirements. It allows for electronic filing of returns. It increases the statute of limitations for investigations from six months to two years. That is about it for the positives.

On the negatives, the bill classifies lobbyists not on what they do but rather who they work for. They should be defined by their activities, not their employers. All professional lobbyists should be treated the same. Further, the red book promises that the recommendations from the 1992 unanimous Holtmann report will be implemented by the Liberal government. Removal of the tiers was an explicit Holtmann report recommendation.

A lobbyist is defined as someone who lobbies as a significant part of their duties. John Turner, who may only lobby two or three times a year, can make a case that he is not a significant lobbyist and therefore he does not have to register. A better definition is someone who is paid to attempt to influence the government.

There is nothing wrong with having lobbyists, but let us make sure it is open and transparent and above board.

(1825)

The bill does not address the problem of using past and current political ties to gain access and influence. Past political positions held and political donations should be declared. The fees paid to lobbyists are not included on the list of disclosure requirements even though when in opposition the Liberals insisted on it and the chief government whip wrote a report calling for disclosure.

It would help to show when there has been a massive lobbying campaign on any one side of an issue like the Charlottetown accord. The bill specifies that the individual lobbyist must register but he need not disclose the name of the government official he is lobbying.

For the Pearson deal we would only know that the Department of Transport was lobbied but we would not know who the individuals were. This sends a message that specific lobbyists must be held accountable but not specific public office holders.

Who in the Department of Transport was lobbied? That is what we have to know. The bill has a loophole whereby any meeting initiated by a public office holder need not be disclosed.

This is obviously a major flaw because, as Jean Chenier of *The Lobby Monitor* said, "Any lobbyist who cannot get an invitation from a public servant is not worth his retainer".

The bill completely ignores anti-avoidance schemes. Even with the relatively uncomplicated act before the bill there were anti-avoidance schemes developed. Not dealing with them is a problem, another Holtmann report recommendation ignored.

We also suggest the registrar who administers the act be given the power to perform random audits to better ensure lobbyists are complying with the provisions of the act. That is a very solid and concrete recommendation or proposal by the Reform Party.

The bill also touches on the ethics counsellor. The biggest scam perpetrated on the House is in the red book. It is quite clear. It is on page 95: "The ethics counsellor will report directly to Parliament".

The ethics counsellor was hired. We know the gentleman's name. We are not questioning his ability. We are questioning to whom the ethics counsellor reports. It is to the Prime Minister, directly to the Prime Minister.

He is not a watchdog, which is what an ethics counsellor should be, on behalf of Parliament to restore integrity and to restore politicians to the high standards they were held in back in the old days. He is not a watchdog, he is a lapdog.

If the Prime Minister is involved in a situation in which there are close family ties—and there is no accusation of wrongdoing, none whatsoever—we want the process to be transparent and the ethics counsellor to be able to say to the House that it is transparent. The fact that the gentleman is the Prime Minister's son-in-law should have no bearing on the decision rendered in cabinet. The order in council should be above board. They should be in the best interest of all Canadians. There is no more to it.

We want to be able to trust and accept unequivocally the decisions of the ethics counsellor. We cannot do that now because the ethics counsellor answers directly to the Prime Minister. He does not answer to Parliament. It is a direct violation, another promise of the Liberal government in its red book.

**Ms. Augustine:** Rubbish.

**Mr. Silye:** That is not rubbish. It is on page 95. Nod your head if you agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that in the red book it says the ethics counsellor is supposed to report to Parliament or to the Prime Minister. I know you cannot nod your head. I withdraw the request.

The ethics counsellor must investigate any time he has reason to believe there has been a breach in the code of conduct for lobbyists and he must report his findings. He must also file an annual report on the operation of his office. That is a good element.

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** That is not true.

**Mr. Silye:** I will say it again because I hear members opposite saying it is not true. I would not stand here in the House and say that the Liberal promise is not in the red book. I would not do that. The authors of the red book promised an ethics counsellor would report to Parliament. The ethics counsellor does not report to Parliament and all those geniuses jabbering on the other side better get their facts straight. It is a direct violation, a broken promise.

Along with the government we wish to restore integrity to politicians. We have to get there from here because there is a long way to go. The book *On the Take* has cast a negative light on all politicians.

(1830)

I am a rookie politician. I am a politician now by profession because I get paid for it, but in my heart and in my mind I am still a businessman. I know what I thought two years ago when I was on the outside looking in here at what these people were doing. I was not too happy about that. I was so frustrated that I decided to run.

Now I am hoping that by being here and being able to express my point of view I can now say I would like to restore integrity to politicians. The government should be listening rather than talking. I know some of its members are very talented and can talk and listen at the same time, but not too many people are able to do that.

When I accuse the government of sophistry, which is no more than using clever but misleading arguments for a false conclusion, sleight of hand is another good way of saying it, my concern is it talks about the great and wonderful things it is doing for the country when it really is not. It is letting Canadians down.

It has bills like the Lobbyists Registration Act and the motion today for a joint committee on a code of ethics, a joint committee with the Senate and the House of Commons to enact a bill that would define the code of ethics. Why is there a need for all this?

Two months ago the Prime Minister said in the House that we have all these things in place. Cabinet ministers must take all sorts of oaths. We have to take oaths as members of Parliament. We have all sorts of rules controlling what we can and cannot do. We are into about six levels of controls to ensure we restore respectability for parliamentarians.

We want to know what is happening in the bureaucracy. We want to know who is in charge. The Lobbyists Registration Act does make a lobbyist register who they are lobbying with within the department. Are they seeing the deputy minister? Are they

seeing Mr. Dodge? The Canadian public should know that after a meeting with Mr. Dodge he changed his mind on a certain issue or that his recommendation changed. There is nothing wrong with that. That is a positive. That is not a negative and yet the government will not put that in.

We have about three or four strong recommendations for the bill and we will continue to put them forward in the interest of all parliamentarians and in the best interest of some lobbyists. There may be some former politicians who after a couple of years off could come back and be lobbyists, and they would be darn good lobbyists, to help their reputation, to help them build on the experience they have gained by working in government so they can help other Canadians. Through open disclosure and the rules working both ways, I believe the bill could help a lot of people within government.

The bill is another example of the feel good, talk good, do nothing government that likes to tell us everything it is doing is wonderful and there is no room for improvement. I am sorry to hear that. With my intervention today I hope maybe one or two of these suggestions I have made may stick, although I rather doubt it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before I go to questions and comments, the hon. member for Calgary Centre in his intervention used the word “sophistry” and really piqued my curiosity. He did describe the meaning of the word but I had to go through Webster’s new dictionary of synonyms and the concise Oxford dictionary to find out exactly the meaning of the word.

On another note, at one point in his intervention he asked the Chair to participate in some way in the debate by nodding. The last time I nodded I was at a friend’s farm and ended up buying something I did not want and have never used since.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that was a very wise ruling on your part. I will try to remember it when I attend the next farm auction as well.

(1835)

He indicated he favoured the removal of the tiers for the different categories of lobbyists for the purpose of registration. This subject came up some minutes before the member started his speech. I have to repeat a question I asked of another hon. member.

The Dairy Farmers of Canada and a number of other groups testified before our committee. They indicated it was unfair to apply rules to them. I can imagine it would be unfair to apply to the Dairy Farmers of Canada and to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the Red Cross the same kind of rules we would apply to Earnscliffe or S.A. Murray Consulting or any one of those consultant lobbyists. The member has advocated we should do this.

*Adjournment Debate*

Does he not agree that for the kind of groups I have identified the requirements should be different? If he agrees with me, why is he making this criticism?

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question and the intervention. It was a very good comment. I do not agree with the member because if these groups are asked to come to the standing committee or if they come to the House and go through the offices of members and want to give information, that is okay if it is strictly giving information. However, some are here to influence MPs, to lobby MPs. A lot of people come into my office and try to set up meetings to tell me what their problems are, what the solutions are and to suggest what I should consider, that maybe I should vote a certain way on a bill.

As soon as they start talking about how I should vote or how I should look at a certain situation that basically is influence peddling.

**Mr. Boudria:** That is a criminal offence.

**Mr. Silye:** I should not say it is influence peddling. Somebody said it is a criminal offence to influence peddle. I take that back. As I have said, I am a rookie. I do not know all the terminology.

When they come here to influence the Department of Transport or the Department of Health or whatever department, for example a pharmaceutical lobbyist or someone lobbying for agriculture, if it is for information it is okay but if it is to influence the department or the ministry or affects any kind of decision before the government, they should register. What is wrong with registering? I do not see why they would object to that.

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I as well know a bit about sophistry. Sophistry is a lot of rhetoric, knowing how to use words that mean virtually nothing.

In this case when we are talking about lobbying it is a very serious issue in spite of the fact that the project under study, Bill C-43, does not have any teeth. I ask the member what he thinks about nepotism. We have been examining over the past couple of weeks the fact the Prime Minister would actually arrange to favour a firm owned by his nephew. That is a clear and flagrant case of nepotism. No one can doubt it. No one should doubt it. It is not only apparent, it is difficult to argue otherwise being that the whole system is filled with people closely connected to Power Corp. or closely connected to the Prime Minister who have actually acted in a very exceptional way overturning a decision by the CRTC. This is the first time in history. One really has to have a lot of power. We are not talking about the average lobbying firm. We are talking about corruption in high

places. We are talking about a Prime Minister favouring the firm of his nephew.

In spite of the fact it is quite obvious, high stake patronage and corruption, the Liberal government finds this to be a subject of humour. This is a flagrant example of the misuse and abuse of power.

What I would like to ask the member—

**Mr. Fontana:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure on careful reflection of the blues the use of such words as “corruption” are unparliamentary. I think the member ought to apologize now. If he does not have the guts to do that, he should step outside and use those words—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order. Let me take things in reverse order. I appeal to the hon. member who just had the floor, in the spirit of parliamentary language the word by itself is not unparliamentary. However, some words that come to mind which would replace the one I heard are “courage” and “fortitude” as opposed to the word used by the hon. parliamentary secretary.

With regard to his initial appeal as to whether a word was unparliamentary, I did not hear of any one word that was unparliamentary, and I was listening with a great deal of attention.

However, the time has elapsed. I have taken into consideration the 13 minutes I had to allow for the ministerial statement.

It being 6.43, we will now move to the adjournment motion.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 is deemed to have been moved.

### JOB CREATION

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on February 24, I asked the Minister of Human Resources Development a question concerning the inactivity, the inertia of government in the field of economics and the fact that it could not just sit back and let the economy do the work.

At that time, in February, I indicated that, according to the latest report of the Quebec's Ministry of Income Security, there were 797,000 welfare recipients in Quebec alone. We learned last weekend that there were 808,000 in April. We also know that, last month, the unemployment rate rose to 12 per cent. These figures are very disturbing. In February, the minister answered that the government had created over 433,000 jobs.

*Adjournment Debate*

I then said to the minister that it was extremely unwise to use monthly statistics comparing February of this year to February of last year because we all know that the only reliable figures in this case are annual data. Now the annual data for the year ending January 1995 show that only 261,000 jobs were created. That is not much.

(1845)

It is certainly not much because the previous government, at the same time after the last recession, had done more and better. So when we say there are now 808,000 welfare recipients where there were 797,000 two months ago, replying that the economy is creating jobs—and that it is fantastic—is frankly insulting. It is insulting for all those who are desperately looking for work, those who cannot receive unemployment insurance because of the new eligibility rules introduced by the government, for those who lose their unemployment benefits earlier than they used to and have no other choice but to go on welfare.

A great number of people have lost hope. Those people want to know that we care for them, and for a great many of those people at this very moment in Quebec, sovereignty is the only way to really achieve something. This has to be known.

So, while the Prime Minister said over the weekend that he wanted to deal with real issues rather than talk about the constitution and that it was a shame that the Parti Québécois wanted only to talk about constitutional matters, I say that the Parti Québécois does not want to discuss constitutional issues but to take the necessary means to finally deal seriously with unemployment.

Many people who are convinced and all the Prime Minister is doing is showing that we are right. Despite the fact that 808 000 people are on welfare and 12 per cent of the population is unemployed, the Prime Minister says he is impatient to deal with the real issues. This government has been in office for 18 months. What is its record? Are we back to the employment level we had before the recession, consistent with population growth? No.

A lot of people are disheartened by this situation. For a lot of Quebec workers who want to improve their fate, their only chance is really to undertake to do everything by themselves.

We could have expected this government to tackle the problems, since it still has to prove that its promises mean something. But it decided instead to let the economy fend for itself. It simply let business make drastic cuts. It let businesses close their doors. In matters of job creation, it is satisfied with results that are inferior to what the previous government had reached, and it is not taking into account the population growth.

In other words, the present government's record is much poorer than that of the previous government, which was not that hot in the first place.

It is intolerable to be told that everything is going beautifully, because over a million Quebecers are experiencing tragic situations, and need jobs to improve their lives.

[English]

**Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government recognizes the very large economic and social costs associated with high levels of unemployment. Since it took office in October 1993 it has worked very hard to create the climate necessary for jobs and economic growth.

A number of measures have been taken to stimulate employment growth in Canada. These include putting in place a joint federal-provincial-municipal infrastructure program; rolling back the planned increase of UI premium rates, thereby lowering a major barrier to hiring new people; signing the first ever agreement to reduce internal trade barriers between the provinces and the territories; launching a national tourism program to stimulate job creation in tourism related industries; introducing a number of measures to encourage the development of small and medium size businesses, the main engine of job growth; and creating the youth internship program and Youth Services Canada to smooth young people's transition from school to work, thereby reducing the high rate of youth unemployment.

Last fall the Prime Minister also led a very successful Team Canada trade mission which brought home opportunities that will create thousands of jobs in Canada and Quebec. Three months ago the Prime Minister led a second trade mission to the dynamic economies of Latin America.

The result so far shows that our employment growth strategy is working. Since October 1993 over 430,000 additional new jobs have been created across the country. The unemployment rate declined by almost one full percentage point in 1994 compared to 1993. Even though employment growth has slowed in the last few months, economists are forecasting a continuation of strong employment growth this year and again in 1996.

I can assure the hon. member opposite the federal government is committed to continuing its effort within the tight fiscal constraint it is facing to help Canadians find and keep their jobs all across the country, in Quebec, Atlantic Canada and the west.

If the member wants to participate in making possible a constructive economy she should stop talking about separation in the province of Quebec, along with her colleagues in the separatist party, and start talking about creating jobs for the people of Quebec.

*Adjournment Debate*

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to Standing Order 38, the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.52 p.m.)

---



# CONTENTS

Monday, May 1, 1995

---

## Suspension of Sitting

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11.06 a.m.) ..... 11965

## Sitting Resumed

(The House resumed at 12 p.m.) ..... 11965

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Code of conduct

Mr. Gray .....	11965
Motion .....	11965
Mr. Bélisle .....	11967
Mr. Epp .....	11971
Mr. Simmons .....	11974
Mr. Epp .....	11976
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	11977
Mr. Simmons .....	11977
Mr. Fillion .....	11977
Mr. Boudria .....	11979

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Bala and District Lions Club

Mr. Mitchell ..... 11981

### Immigration

Mr. Nunez ..... 11981

### Tax inequity

Mr. Hanger ..... 11981

**Ontario Elections**

Mr. Knutson ..... 11981

**Volunteers**

Mrs. Brushett ..... 11981

**Grand River**

Mrs. Stewart (Brant) ..... 11982

**Workers's Rights**

Mr. Leroux (Shefford) ..... 11982

**West Coast Fisheries**

Mr. Mayfield ..... 11982

**Infrastructure**

Mr. de Jong ..... 11982

**Physiotherapy**

Mr. Graham ..... 11983

**Firefighters**

Ms. Torsney ..... 11983

**Rights of the Child**

Mr. Duhamel ..... 11983

**Labour Relations**

Mrs. Lalonde ..... 11983

**Organ Donation**

Mr. Hill (MacLeod) ..... 11984

**Biennial Convention of the Liberal Party**

Mr. Bertrand ..... 11984

**National Unity**

Mr. O'Brien ..... 11984

## **Gun Control**

Mr. Bryden ..... 11984

## **Pearson International Airport**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) ..... 11984

# **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

## **Social Assistance**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 11985

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 11985

Mr. Bouchard ..... 11985

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 11985

Mr. Bouchard ..... 11985

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 11985

## **Telecommunications**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) ..... 11986

Mr. Manley ..... 11986

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) ..... 11986

Mr. Manley ..... 11986

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 11986

Mr. Dupuy ..... 11986

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 11986

Mr. Manley ..... 11987

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 11987

Mr. Dupuy ..... 11987

Mr. de Savoye ..... 11987

Mr. Manley ..... 11987

Mr. de Savoye ..... 11987

Mr. Manley ..... 11987

## **Members of Parliament Pensions**

Miss Grey ..... 11988

Mr. Duhamel ..... 11988

Miss Grey ..... 11988

Mr. Duhamel ..... 11988

## **Seagram**

Mr. Duceppe .....	11988
Mr. Dupuy .....	11988
Mr. Duceppe .....	11988
Mr. Dupuy .....	11988

## **Harbourfront**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	11989
Mr. Dingwall .....	11989

## **Winnipeg Jets**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	11989
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	11989

## **Bosnia**

Mr. Jacob .....	11989
Mr. Ouellet .....	11989
Mr. Jacob .....	11989
Mr. Ouellet .....	11990

## **Fisheries**

Mrs. Payne .....	11990
Mr. Tobin .....	11990

## **Bosnia and Croatia**

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	11990
Mr. Collenette .....	11990
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	11990
Mr. Collenette .....	11990

## **Labour Relations**

Mr. St-Laurent .....	11990
Mr. Massé .....	11990
Mr. St-Laurent .....	11991
Mr. Massé .....	11991

## **Highways**

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	11991
--------------------------------------	-------

Mr. Young .....	11991
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	11991
Mr. Young .....	11991

**Official Languages**

Mr. Harvard .....	11991
Mr. Duhamel .....	11992

**Volunteer Work**

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	11992
Mr. Dupuy .....	11992

**Immigration**

Mr. Hanger .....	11992
Mr. Marchi .....	11992

**Non-Governmental Organizations**

Mr. Robinson .....	11992
Mr. Ouellet .....	11992

**National Defence**

Mr. Telegdi .....	11993
Mr. Collenette .....	11993

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Milliken .....	11993
--------------------	-------

**Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty**

Mr. Chan .....	11993
Mr. Jacob .....	11994
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	11994

**Committees of the House**

**Procedure and House Affairs**

Mr. Milliken .....	11995
--------------------	-------

## **Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act**

Bill C-87. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	11995
Mr. MacLaren .....	11995

## **Agreement on Internal Trade Implementation Act**

Bill C-88. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	11995
Mr. Young .....	11995

## **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**

Bill C-323. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted. ....	11995
Mr. Forseth .....	11995

## **Committees of the House**

### **Procedure and House Affairs**

Motion for concurrence in 74th Report .....	11996
Mr. Milliken .....	11996
(Motion agreed to) .....	11996

## **Petitions**

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Richardson .....	11996
----------------------	-------

### **Intoxication Defence**

Mr. Richardson .....	11996
----------------------	-------

### **Justice**

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	11996
--------------------------------------	-------

### **Agriculture**

Mr. Morrison .....	11996
--------------------	-------

### **Official Languages**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	11996
----------------------------------	-------

### **Family**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	11997
----------------------------------	-------

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	11997
----------------------------------	-------

**Bill C-41**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) ..... 11997

**Gun Control**

Mr. Gouk ..... 11997

**Euthanasia**

Mr. Fewchuk ..... 11997

Mr. Murphy ..... 11997

**Human Rights**

Mr. Murphy ..... 11997

**Gun Control**

Mr. Knutson ..... 11997

**Human Rights**

Mr. Knutson ..... 11997

**Justice**

Mr. Knutson ..... 11997

**Human Rights**

Mr. Forseth ..... 11997

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken ..... 11998

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Code of conduct**

Consideration resumed of motion and amendment ..... 11998

Mr. Boudria ..... 11998

Mr. Gouk ..... 12000

Mr. Gagliano ..... 12002

    Mr. Asselin ..... 12005

Mr. Langlois ..... 12006

    Mr. Shepherd ..... 12008

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	12009
Mr. Milliken .....	12011
Mr. Shepherd .....	12012
Mr. Hermanson .....	12012
Division on amendment deferred .....	12015

**Lobbyists Registration Act**

Bill C-43. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading .....	12015
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	12016
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	12017
Mr. Epp .....	12018
Mr. Fillion .....	12019
Mr. Boudria .....	12020
Mr. de Savoye .....	12021
Mr. Silye .....	12021
Mr. Boudria .....	12024
Mr. Marchand .....	12025

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Job Creation**

Mrs. Lalonde .....	12025
Mr. Fontana .....	12026