

*Supply*

would simply say: "Look, I have done what I have done. Here is my record. Judge me on it. It is up to you to decide what our standards of conduct should be".

As an individual member of the House of Commons there are some things in the record of this government, in its earlier years particularly, I find profoundly disturbing. There seems to be an extraordinary number of people, more than ever before in our history, who have ended up before the courts. I suspect that sort of thing is likely to happen to any party that gains a huge influx of new members with no previous political and public life experience. They do not understand when they come here in those kinds of numbers the difference between standards of conduct acceptable in the public realm and those in the private sector.

Those are comments more than they are questions. I suspect we will have some agreement. I hope it is not simply because the government House leader is sitting on that side. It is a view which I think is important to express. I would like to hear a response of the government House leader on it.

**Mr. Andre:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments because I absolutely agree. I think he is dead on. We do have that tendency. The moment it appears a rule is broken the outcry is for tougher rules.

If we were to use the analogy of traffic by-laws, that every time someone breaks a speeding by-law we get tougher speeding laws, soon no one would be able to drive. We would soon constrict things and make it impossible to get about. We do that, the member is right, and the outcome is disturbing.

One reality in all this is that the message is very clear. The way to stay out of trouble is to follow each and every rule to the absolute nth degree. No matter that doing so produces bad value for the government, produces something that is awkward and is not responsive to the real situation or that the rules may not be appropriate in the real situation. We cannot get into trouble for sticking to the rules rigidly but we can sure waste a lot of money.

I mentioned in my speech a quote from that fellow MacLean who reviewed the book *Reinventing Government*. He really talked about it. He said that we should concentrate on outputs, not inputs, and that rather than say all the processes must be followed to the nth degree we ask what happened. I can be a tad partisan. Some of

the malfeasance we have been accused of on this side is that we have done things contrary to the rules.

The fact of the matter is a better test to me for fraudulent activity is: "Did you personally enrich yourself or your friends at the expense of the taxpayer?" If one breaks the rules to provide better value for the taxpayer in terms of the program or whatnot, if it goes out to whomever, make it immigrants or whomever, surely it is almost something to be applauded.

• (1620)

Around here, this is all that needs to occur. It is what Kennedy and Cobb were talking about. They feel there was a technical breaking of the rules. That to them is equivalent to corruption. That is what I found despicable about that whole string of articles. They had the testimony of public servants who said it is a more honest system than what we had 10 years ago. I know that when I was over there I struggled with the system.

How does one contract for services? How does one find a fair way to decide which engineer to hire, which accountants or which lawyers? It is very tough.

For advertising, we have come up with this scheme which duplicates the private sector. To have these guys say that we are all corrupt because in their view we should have provided a written report—that is how they read the rules and therefore that is evidence of corruption—is a misstatement.

If this thing were to blow up and become a fact, we would have to write a new set of rules which would be the kind of bureaucratic imposition you are talking about. It serves nobody's purpose.

I would agree with you. Maybe the member and I could talk some time about how we could bring about that attitude and that result.

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Madam Speaker, yesterday in Question Period the minister indicated that the government would be bringing in a bill dealing with the report of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House dealing with conflict of interest.

I was wondering if that bill would contain the amendments that were recommended to the government in the conflict of interest report as an amendment to the Parliament of Canada Act. I was wondering whether he