

*Motions*

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) is away right now and obviously not in a position to speak to a question of privilege.

Normally, the Member who is on the receiving end of this kind of statement is given a chance to reply. However, in his statement the Hon. Member for Drummond (Mr. Guilbault) left out something very important: he did not conclude his statement with a motion.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that although the Hon. Member for Drummond made a statement on a matter that is important to him, it is not a genuine question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the Chair could comment on this problem. We have a situation where an Hon. Member is the subject of a complaint by the Hon. Member for Drummond (Mr. Guilbault). The former Member is not here this afternoon. In the circumstances, I think the Chair could suggest that Hon. Members postpone debate on this question until tomorrow or some other day, when the other Hon. Member will be in the House. I think the Chair's suggestion should be agreeable to all Members and that it is probably the best thing to do for the time being.

**Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau):** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. After listening carefully to the Hon. Member for Drummond, I think it would be in the best interests of all concerned if we knew exactly what the Hon. Member's complaint is about. Apparently, he says the letter that was made public is a letter he did not sign himself and that someone released or signed this letter without his permission. He has not named anyone and has not indicated at all who in his office would have released such a document without his approval. I therefore suggest he clarify the matter so that the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) can be more specific in his reply.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the comments made by the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) are very apt. He has raised an important point. Perhaps it would be a good thing if the Hon. Member for Drummond were given a chance to elaborate, just to clarify the point raised by the Hon. Member for Papineau.

The Hon. Member for Drummond (Mr. Guilbault).

**Mr. Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, I can inform the Hon. Member for Papineau that the document handed round yesterday by his colleague, the Hon. Member for Shefford, has no letterhead, was not signed by me and in fact was signed by no one. And I repeat that the Hon. Member showed the document to the press.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think that in the circumstances, and consistent with the practice of the Chair, it would probably be better to postpone consideration of this matter until all Members concerned can be present. The question could then be pursued on some other occasion. For the time being, debate on the subject is adjourned.

• (1520)

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**ELECTIONS, PRIVILEGES AND PROCEDURE****CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Rodriguez that the first report of the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure presented to the House on Tuesday, January 27, 1987, be concurred in.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate this afternoon in the motion to concur in the report of the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure dealing with the issue of the registration of lobbyists.

[Translation]

As you will undoubtedly recall, Mr. Speaker, it was on September 9, 1985 that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) tabled in this House a document concerning public sector ethics.

And you will recall that in this document, all wrapped up in a nice blue ribbon, the Prime Minister told us that it was necessary to regain, he said, the respect of Canadians for our Government institutions. If this was true on September 9, 1985, Mr. Speaker, you can imagine what the Canadian Government would have to do today—February 12, 1987—to regain the confidence of Canadians. Here is what the Prime Minister told us on September 9, 1985:

It is a great principle of public administration—I could even say an "imperative"—that to function effectively the Government and the public service of a democracy must have the trust and confidence of the public they serve. In order to reinforce that trust, the Government must be able to provide competent management and, above all, to be guided by the highest standards of conduct.

My God! Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was explaining some of the measures he wanted to take to shore up this code of public ethics. He said he wanted, first:

A new Conflict of Interest/Post-Employment Code for Public Office Holders.

We know what happened to that one.

Then he went on to say:

Instructions to Ministers imposing specific and strict limitations on the hiring of family members.

Third, he had sent:

Letters to Opposition Leaders on the subject of ethical standards for MPs and Senators.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister wanted all Members of Parliament to share the blame equally, strongly hoping he would not have to bear so much of the blame.

Fourth, he said he wanted to establish:

An experimental program of parliamentary scrutiny of Governor in Council appointments. 5. The registration of lobbying activity.