

Motions

that come as a result of what people in the Government have done. As an Opposition we cannot very well decide to let the Government off the hook. It might only encourage its Members to do other things that are improper. On the other hand, I think that all of us would agree that, because we have to concentrate on these things, it is a disservice to the political process and to things that do need to be addressed.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I have not addressed the details of the recommendations of the committee on lobbying and I apologize for that, but only to a certain degree, because sometimes things have to be put in larger perspective, and sometimes the heckling of Members like the Minister for International Trade have to be answered. For that, I hope you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I enjoyed the speech of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie). Somewhere in it there were a few remarks about the subject, but his speech was more about international trade than it was about the registration of lobbyists. I guess it is normal and understandable that somebody who deals from a socialist perspective would be much more concerned about the registration of lobbyists who deal with commerce since profit is such a dirty word for the socialists.

Mr. Rodriguez: Nonsense.

Mr. Friesen: Hear me out. The Hon. Member over there has been so calm up to now. Please do not get excited now.

Mr. Rodriguez: Don't make ridiculous statements.

Mr. Friesen: I do not know why New Democrats would be so concerned about other lobbyists. It seems to be that what we are talking about is the registration of a pedigree of lobbyists. What are their credentials and backgrounds? We are not talking about their right to lobby. It is not about the free flow of information. I do not understand why the Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill would be implying that any suggestion to register lobbyists who work in a non-commercial area would be an infringement on the flow of ideas or the threatening of a flow of ideas just because you ask people to declare their pedigrees. Let me give an example.

About 40 years ago there was a famous set of hearings heard along the Mackenzie Valley about the pipeline. The Member talked about southerners going up north. In those hearings the Member may recall that one of the people sent up north was a very prominent Member of the NDP working on behalf of the CBC.

An Hon. Member: Give us his name.

Mr. Friesen: What was his name?

An Hon. Member: He doesn't know.

Mr. Friesen: He does not know. He lobbied for a year or more organizing native groups along a certain perspective, a particular point of view, and here you had spontaneous native

organizations coming to the Berger hearings. They all said somewhat the same thing. Mr. Berger, the learned judge, conducting those hearings had a learned counsel who was part of his legal staff, who happens now to be the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell). Is it any wonder that the outcome of the Berger hearings produced a report that was so parallel to the views of the New Democratic Party at the time? Is that a strange coincidence?

Maybe it would have been helpful at the time when dealing with a non-commercial venture, because we were dealing not only with a pipeline but with the future of the north as the Member said, for all those involved in developing the thought forms and the positions of the people up north—that the people doing that should have registered their pedigree and background.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta makes a very strange argument. First, with respect to the Berger Commission, these were public hearings. These were people who presented their views in public, whereas in general when we are talking about lobbying we are talking about that which is done in private. That major distinction was not made. It was no secret. Maybe the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta just found out, but everybody knew at the time that Tom Berger was a former leader of the New Democratic Party.

I find it interesting that when judges in Canada, most of whom at one time or other were either Liberal or Conservative, make a report, and people criticize it, you hear that it was an independent judicial judgment on the matter at hand, and people say they do not know why Members of the New Democratic Party would want to question the integrity of the judge who made such an austere and wise ruling. When former Liberal and Conservative judges make rulings, we are supposed to regard them with due respect, but when a judge who has a New Democratic Party history makes recommendations which have an affinity for what the New Democratic Party might have recommended, this somehow is political in the worst sense of the word. I think there is an obvious double standard. The Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta believes in that Liberal-Conservative world of his. From his point of view, Liberal-Conservative things are value neutral and are just a fact of life. It is only things outside that world view which are seen to be political.

● (1630)

I have news for the Hon. Member. His views are political. The views of judges who have Liberal and Conservative political histories are political. They are every bit as informed or not informed, as the case may be, depending upon the objectivity of the judge in question, by their political histories, as are judges with NDP histories. I find the Hon. Member's argument to be a good example of the double standard applied to members of the judiciary who have NDP backgrounds. These members are called to account for the things they say that may have political intonations as Mr. Berger was when he