

basis. We had to be extremely careful not to cast too broad a net in our definition of what is a lobbyist.

For the purposes of this Bill I have classed lobbyists in three categories. First, there are trade sector lobbyists. They are obvious; they have been here for years. For example, we have the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, the dairy people and the cheese people. The various people involved in agriculture have offices here to protect and look after their interests and indeed to pursue these interests with the Government of the day. This is a legitimate exercise. We have these trade lobbyists. They have offices in Ottawa and they operate up front.

Then we have a second group. These are the people who represent the voluntary sector. The obvious one which comes to mind is the Canadian Red Cross, but there are others. For example, we have people who operate offices here and have paid executives on behalf of the Right to Life movement. They pursue the interests of their organizations by trying to influence the Government to change the Criminal Code and the legislation affecting abortion. Of course we have people who pursue other interests in terms of representing the voluntary sector, whether it be capital punishment, the rights of non-smokers and those of smokers or what have you. All of these are legitimate in, and of, their own right. Not only do these people have the right to lobby the Government and Parliament, but we had to be careful not to do anything to restrict that right. We have to be extremely prudent that we do not, by way of legislation, restrict the rights of citizens in any way to have access to the Government and to Members of Parliament.

Then there is a third group. These are the so-called consultants who operate on a fee for service basis. We have seen a growth in this group over the past dozen years or so. Indeed, I would anticipate with the reforms in this institution that they will become even more active as they target Members of Parliament, who will have considerable leeway in their legislative powers, will become legitimate targets for lobbying. For example, if we are to reform private Members' business, as I hope we will, notwithstanding some of the reservations expressed by members of the Opposition Parties, then there will be private Members' Bills which will become law. Obviously private Members would then be the target of lobbyists who will want to get various Bills of one kind or another through to become law. It is all the more urgent that we address this matter. It seems to me that it flows almost consequentially from the work of the Special Committee on the Reform of the House of Commons. Indeed, I presented the Bill for first reading just a few days after the presentation of the Second and Third Reports of the Special Committee on the Reform of the House of Commons; I believe it was on the day we adjourned, which would have been June 28 last year.

Just as a matter of interest, I examined the Order Paper and I think that currently there are a total of 60 private Members' Bills in place. I do not know what will be the fate of this particular private Member's Bill, but certainly we all know what happens generally speaking to private Members' Bills in the House—they are talked out, so no one takes us seriously.

### *Lobby Registration Act*

Indeed, not even the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), speaking on his own behalf presumably and speaking on behalf of his Party, took private Members' business seriously when he said, as quoted in *The Globe and Mail* of January 21: "It is not the role of the private Member to legislate on matters of great national significance". I do not agree with that. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is a great parliamentarian who has contributed significantly to parliamentary reform. He was an active member of the Lefebvre committee in the last Parliament and provided leadership and support to the reform committee whose reports are now before the House. I do not believe that that truly reflects his views. When we examine the Order Paper and the 60 private Members' Bills which are there, 18 of them come from the Party represented by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. Just taking a look at some of the private Members' Bills, we have Bill C-202, an Act to Amend the Criminal Code (capital punishment); Bill C-205 an Act to Amend the Criminal Code (gun control); an Act to revoke the conviction of Louis Riel; an Act to amend the Criminal Code (abortion); an Act to require assistance in the search of missing children; an Act respecting the conservation, export and diversion of water resources; and an Act to amend the Criminal Code (child abuse). I believe that these are matters of great national significance. I further believe that no one would deny Members of Parliament the right to bring in Bills to address these matters of great national concern and ultimately to have these Bills become law.

Bill C-248, which has been before the House since June 28, has been postponed on three separate occasions. I postponed it deliberately because I was hoping that the measures dealing with the reform of private Members' business would be in place and that this could be the kind of Bill which—and I say "could" because it would be subject to the scrutiny and judgment of my parliamentary peers—could be deemed worthy of second reading and going on to a committee. I deliberately did so because I felt that we would now have in place provisions whereby that could happen. Of course I refer to the private Members' provisions of the Third Report of the Special Committee on the Reform of the House of Commons. I hope indeed that will happen. In any event, I felt it was time to get on with this Bill. In fairness to other Members who have Bills, I should really address mine and give the House a chance to speak to it.

● (1710)

I have talked about the fundamental right of private citizens to be able to make representations to the Government and to Parliament. I talked about the absolute necessity to be very careful in anything we do so as not to deny or restrict in any way that fundamental right. That is a fundamental right of any citizen in a democratic society. My concern is not with these people, although I must repeat, we have to be careful not to do anything to restrict that legitimate activity. My concern is to address what we call the paid lobbyists, because their actions are beyond public scrutiny. It is my conviction that it is time we formally recognize the presence and the role of the