

Supply

Whether it is a public ad contract given to a Tory firm or jobs critical to the public interest, handed to organizations, the interests of taxpayers are not being served but sold. What is most disturbing is not that firms are favoured by their Tory connections but that the cash they receive serves no valuable purpose for Canadians.

Earlier this month this House debated a bill asking Parliament to borrow another \$8.2 billion to be flushed down the Tory drain. The only certainty is that taxpayers will have to pay this money back at some considerable premium in the years to come. What is also certain is that these funds will be squandered away in the usual Tory way.

What new treasures can we expect from a new round of borrowing? Of course we can never be sure how this government will end up spending its new cash. Scarcely two years ago, we were told about the wonders of this government's green plan. Environment is a priority we were told.

This December the same government continued the defoliation of the green plan by cutting another \$172 million of proposed spending. But can we find \$21 million for useless TV ads? The Prime Minister's answer: "Yes, we can". Rather than use money it borrows to help extinguish the recession, this government continues to allow business after business to be engulfed in bankruptcy.

The most puzzling spending choice of all surrounds the refusal of the government to pay the \$250,000 legal bill for the Stevenson family, whose efforts and personal expense have caused all Canadians to be aware of how little this government has done to protect society against criminals who prey on children.

How can we understand that the Stevenson inquest was not worth government funds but millions can be fluttered away on self-promotion? We wonder how this can be. How can we have unprecedented dependence on welfare, the need for every government dollar so great, and yet millions squandered for ads?

This is a government that pleads poverty to the poor and the needy by asking where it can find the money, but when it comes to its political friends the only question is where does it send the cheque.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the excellent discourse of our colleague, the member from Mississauga.

She will know of another member for Mississauga who made a speech a little earlier today. I will be generous and call it a speech. Probably she will have listened attentively to those remarks.

I want to ask my colleague if she will give her comments on the government's so-called dedication or interest in bringing in new conflict of interest rules. I ask her to bear the following in mind: that in 1987, after the then minister, Sinclair Stevens, was found in breach of the conflict of interest code on 14 separate counts—by the way he had his legal bills paid for by the government—the government produced a bill called C-46, then C-112 and now it is called C-43. The bill died on the Order Paper twice and another one will probably die on the Order Paper when this session adjourns in a few weeks.

Does she agree with the other member for Mississauga that the government is all gung-ho about new conflict of interest rules or does she agree with me that six years of waiting for conflict of interest rules is long enough, that it shows a complete lack of interest on the part of this government and if it ever moves ahead with the issue it will be a form of deathbed repentance because we will be only weeks away from an election?

Ms. Guarnieri: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague has a talent for making excellent points in the questions he asks.

There is a great deal of public scepticism about the integrity of this administration. The member for Mississauga South earlier made the comment that it does no good to point to the countless number of newspaper articles which delineate the fraud and put this administration into ill-repute. He is quite right, it does denigrate this entire establishment.

As a first-time member I value the privilege of serving in this House. It really does not serve anyone well to have members of ill repute being singled out. However, there is a great deal of scepticism about the honesty and integrity of this government to proceed with any worthwhile measures which will curtail future colleagues from behaving in a fashion that is not worthy of this House.