

Oral Questions

government, much in the same way they were given for the guidance of civil servants, particularly those in higher positions, after they had left government service.

We felt, I think, it would have the support of the House generally, and certainly of public opinion, that we should not attempt to penalize or prevent the men and women who had served their country in either the civil service or in government from ever again working at their trade, and we set a period of one and two years which was meant to create a distance between them and their former employment. We were very specific about the ethics of changing sides and advocating one case after you had defended the contrary case in the government's interest. We were specific in the guidelines in spelling out a certain number of rules which should not be broken.

My examination of the guidelines, without the benefit of talking to Mr. Macdonald since the news came out, has shown that he has not broken the letter or the spirit of the guidelines unless, of course, the spirit is meant to imply that no person who serves in government, either as a political person or as a civil servant, should thereafter be able to work in private enterprise; and this is not the spirit of the guidelines as we see it. The hon. member has in his own party a House leader who, after having left—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Broadbent: As the Prime Minister will recall, the guidelines were not debated in the House but were issued by fiat of the Prime Minister himself. One of the guidelines would have pertained very directly to Mr. Macdonald if he had been a former official as opposed to being a former minister of the Crown. One of them says that for one year former officials are not to give counsel for commercial purposes on programs or policies of the government department with which they were employed during the preceding year.

If this guideline is relevant for a former official for a period of a year, why is not the same guideline strictly relevant, in principle, to a former minister of the Crown whose position of authority or power is much greater than that of an official? If it is relevant, then surely it applies in principle to the case of Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Trudeau: The principle applies to a former department. If Mr. Macdonald had accepted a directorship in a corporation or business which had dealings with the minister of finance or the Department of Finance, then the leader of the NDP would be right. But he has not. If he had accepted the directorship of a bank—obviously, the Department of Finance and banking are closely connected—again the leader of the NDP would be correct. But there is no direct relationship between the Department of Finance and the McDonnell-Douglas Corporation which builds airplanes. It seems to me the guidelines are applicable in a fair way, and the leader of the NDP should understand it.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

[Translation]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**INQUIRY WHETHER QUESTION OF DÉTENTE RAISED WITH NATO COUNTRIES**

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Further to a reply the Prime Minister just gave the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that the Canadian government has accepted to spend for NATO, or under the treaty of the NATO countries, from 12 to 30 per cent all told, can he tell us whether détente was discussed with the representatives of the members of NATO, seeing détente is so dear to the Soviet bloc? In addition, were ways and means discussed of coming to an agreement over the long term with regard to the arms race?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we discussed those matters very much indeed and I thank the hon. member for his interest. I shall see to it that he gets a copy of the news release published yesterday; it should reach him probably later today or tomorrow. He will see that the matter of détente was discussed at length and that the subject proved to be of great interest to all the participants, including myself, with a view to contributing to the progress of the discussions on disarmament as a contributing factor to détente, as well as at the Vienna negotiations on the limitation of conventional armament and the discussions under SALT with regard to the limitation of nuclear weapons. So, we were very much concerned about the matter and we share the concern of the hon. member. We are striving toward a balance of power not only in the increase of expenditures but also in helping to reduce them equitably on both sides.

REASON CANADA DOES NOT BENEFIT FROM FUNDS FOR EXTERNAL DEFENCE

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Canada has committed itself to raise its NATO expenditures by 12 to 30 per cent and that, from what I understand, every time we have raised our expenditures in NATO countries, because we have invested in other countries, for example in Lahr, Germany, and elsewhere, we have not benefited from our expenditures in this security program like other countries do, could the Prime Minister tell us whether he discussed this matter with his counterparts, with the people responsible for this question which in my view is a fundamental matter. If we use taxpayers' money to guarantee our security or to defend ourselves eventually, how come none of this money comes back to this country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have also discussed this matter, and Canada and other countries share the hon. member's concern, namely that much of the money they spend for their defence is spent in other countries, including the United States, England, France