

document to be tabled. We can deal with that; it is very simple and straightforward. Not being a Minister of the Crown, the Member should not normally be allowed to table a document, but he may do so if we have unanimous consent. The tabling of a document comes under a different Standing Order from that of quoting from it. Therefore, is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to table his document?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Laniel: An unknown document, no.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): So we do not have unanimous consent. The second point concerning quoting from a document is also very straightforward. I enjoin the Hon. Member to read Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 329(4), which says:

When quoting a letter in the House, a Member must be willing either to give the name of the author or to take full responsibility for the contents himself.

That means that if the Hon. Member is not willing to give the name of the author of the document, he has to say what is in the document as if he said it himself. He cannot refer to it as a document which originates from a nebulous committee. This being agreed, I ask the Hon. Member to resume his speech and abide by the rules.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I guess the way out of the dilemma is perhaps to put my imagination to work. If I had been at the meeting of the people responsible for these programs, if I had been charged with the task of taking minutes at that meeting, I think the following kinds of things would be what I might have written in those minutes which have reflected—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. The Hon. Member cannot take lightly the ruling that I just made. He has to quote the document or refrain from referring to it as originating from a meeting or being the minutes of a group. He can say straight to the House what he has to say, but if he wants to quote the document he will have to identify it. Let us not try and circumvent the Standing Order; the Hon. Member does not quote the document or, if he does, he quotes the source.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I hope this point of order does not eat into my time.

Some Hon. Members: Yes!

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, let me go back to where I started. There is a sense of confidentiality about these programs which is clear to everyone in the nation. For two years now we have not been able to find out from the Canada Manpower Centre how these funds are allocated. We have not been able to find out through committee hearings or through questions on the Order Paper. Therefore, there is absolutely no question that this is a secret fund of money which comes out of the budget and is allocated in some mysterious way.

Supply

I suggest the specific mechanism involved in the allocation of these funds, Mr. Speaker, puts the Prime Minister's Office, the backroom manipulators of the Liberal Party of Canada, at the very centre of the allocation process. I suggest to Members of this House that I personally have certain knowledge that in the original allocation of this money preceding the June, 1982 Budget, in planning for the spending of this money, the Prime Minister's Office, the backroom manipulators in the Prime Minister's office, were directly involved in screening projects into two streams. The projects were coming directly to the Prime Minister's Office and they were divided into two streams, and we ended up with two major programs. We had fast tracking for smaller local programs and the larger one for special capital construction. That decision was made by the backroom manipulators in the Prime Minister's Office on the basis of projects which came forward to them.

Point number two: Where did the projects come from? Did they come from Canadians generally? No, Mr. Speaker, they came from Ministers. Is that appropriate? In a general sense yes, it is. But these particular projects came forward to the backroom people in the Prime Minister's Office, primarily from the political Minister, the designated Ministers responsible for patronage in each of the ten provinces of Canada. That is where the essence of these projects came from.

The knowledge available to me tells me that when it came to a dilemma or a disagreement between a line Minister responsible for a budget, for example, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox), or the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts), when it came to a difference of opinion between the political Minister in a province and the line Minister responsible for the budgetary funds voted to that line Minister by Parliament, it was the opinion of the political Minister which would prevail in the expenditure of these funds. Does that or does that not constitute a serious violation of some of the basic principles which enable a democracy to work?

Information available to me, Mr. Speaker, talks about hard and soft projects. That information indicates that the civil servants gathered details on projects for funding once they are considered to be hard. What was a hard project? That was a project agreed to by the political Minister. At that point the civil servants were to gather information to enable them to defend that funding or spending decision after the decision was made. On soft projects, those which had not been approved by a political Minister, only headquarters was to gather information on those projects. All members of the committee, the normal civil service network, was not free to gather information on those projects until they had moved from the soft category to the hard category.

That whole system, Mr. Speaker, makes puppets out of line Ministers. We in this House of Commons go through the process of approving the Main Estimates. We put a line Minister up in front of the committee and examine his budgetary expenditure plan. We, as Members of Parliament accountable to the taxpayers of this country, do not see the political Ministers. We do not have a chance to ask them questions