

Messrs.

Fox	Loiselle	Penner
Francis	(Saint-Henri)	Philbrook
Gauthier	Lumley	Pinard
(Ottawa-Vanier)	MacDonald	Portelance
Gendron	(Cardigan)	Poulin
Gillespie	Macdonald	Prud'homme
Goodale	(Rosedale)	Railton
Goyer	MacEachen	Raines
Gray	MacFarlane	Reid
Guay	MacGuigan	Richardson
(Lévis)	Mackasey	Robinson
Guilbault	Maine	Rompkey
Herbert	Marceau	Rooney
Holt (Mrs.)	Marchand	Roy
Hopkins	(Langelier)	(Laval)
Isabelle	Marchand	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Joyal	(Kamloops-Cariboo)	Sharp
Lachance	Martin	Smith
Lajoie	McIsaac	(Saint-Jean)
Landers	McRae	Stanbury
Lang	Milne	Stewart
Langlois	Morin (Mrs.)	(Cochrane)
Laniel	Munro	Stollery
Lapointe	(Hamilton East)	Tessier
Leblanc	Nicholson (Miss)	Trudel
(Laurier)	O'Connell	Turner
LeBlanc	Olivier	(London East)
(Westmorland-Kent)	Ouellet	Turner
Lee	Pearsall	(Ottawa-Carleton)
Lefebvre	Pelletier	Watson
Lessard	(Hochelaga)	Yanakis
Loiselle	Pelletier	Young—124
(Chambly)	(Sherbrooke)	

● (2200)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the Chair.

The Chairman: Order. House in committee of the whole on Bill C-49, to amend the statute law relating to income tax.

It being after ten o'clock, it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

● (2210)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST—USE OF SEAGRAM'S JET BY MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in the adjournment debate this evening on the question of conflict of interest involving the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) and his unfortunate trip on the Seagram jet. For some time we on this side of the House have pressed for a full explanation concerning this trip which is certainly greatly misunderstood and has brought the government into contempt in this House.

28626-64½

Adjournment Debate

I refer to a fact that is well established in precedent and in particular in a letter dated November 30, 1964 signed by the then prime minister of this country, the Right Hon. L. B. Pearson, about what is the proper standard of conduct for a minister of the Crown. In that letter it is stated:

There is an obligation not simply to observe the law but to act in a manner so scrupulous that it will bear the closest public scrutiny. The conduct of public business must be beyond question in terms of moral standards, objectivity and equality of treatment.

It is also stated:

There can be no special treatment on the ground of personal acquaintance, sympathy or anything of that kind. Least of all must there be any suspicion of special treatment when there is cause to believe that a violation or evasion of law may be in issue.

Again, it is stated:

The essential thing is to ensure that all appreciate the grave responsibility, not only that we have but that the members of our staffs and others in positions of authority have, to maintain the confidence of the people of Canada in the probity of government in this country.

I would suggest that these guidelines, laid down by the then prime minister, have been breached by the Minister of National Health and Welfare; and I believe it is unfortunate that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has not seen fit to rebuke the minister for the fact that he has broken the guidelines established over ten years ago.

On November 8, I put on the order paper starred question No. 788 in which I asked the government to identify what in fact are the standards with respect to the conduct of ministers of the Crown at the present time. In my question I basically recited the highlights of the Pearson letter to which I have referred. Specifically in my question I asked if there is any standard which calls upon a minister to:

... refrain from placing himself in a position where he is under obligation to any person who might profit from special consideration or favour on the part of the minister or ministerial colleague or who might seek in any way to gain special treatment from the minister or ministerial colleague...

That question has not yet been answered. I have asked the Prime Minister if he intends to answer it and on all occasions he has been evasive both within this House and outside this House. I would remind hon. members of what transpired.

We learned that the Minister of National Health and Welfare had chosen to take a trip to Israel. We learned that he had chosen to travel on board a Seagram's jet owned by Seagram's of New York.

He travelled for free. We learned this when the minister was in Israel. At that time we suggested he return by some other means, presumably some other aircraft owned by the Canadian government.

The first response of the Prime Minister was to treat it in jest. When the Minister of National Health and Welfare was approached by the press in Israel concerning this trip, he tried to pass it off lightly.

When the minister returned to this House, we pressed him as to who in fact invited him to take the trip. First there was some evasion. The impression was left that somehow it was a trip arranged by the ambassador from Israel. It then transpired that the trip had in fact been arranged between Mr. Bronfman and the Minister of Na-