

honest"; I underline more honest than it was 10 years ago. Does that make a difference? No.

Why possibly could these reporters not have reflected that in their story? Why would Messrs. Kennedy and Cobb not reflect this truth?

Yesterday we had a deuce before the consumer and corporate affairs committee. The committee is looking at the Lobbyists Registration Act. One of the lobbyist, a fellow by the name of Michael Robinson, a well-known Liberal activist, said and I am quoting from the minutes:

There's some evidence that the partisanship may have been part of the motivation.

He was speaking of the motivation of the reporters. He continued:

After two or three stories that appeared in *The Ottawa Citizen* I received a phone call from Gord Ashworth who, as many of you will know, is campaign director for the Liberal Party but also was very active with many of us in the referendum campaign and the nature of the conversation was that it was a phone call to say that he had just finished talking with Mark Kennedy, who is one of the journalists for *The Ottawa Citizen*, who was asking him questions about advertising during the referendum campaign with a view, I assume, to write more stories for *The Citizen* and, in the course of that conversation, asked Gordon if I, personally, was upset at the stories that had appeared in *The Ottawa Citizen*. And when Gordon suggested that yes, indeed, I was less than happy with the coverage, was reassured by Kennedy that I shouldn't be upset because the purpose of these stories was not to get to the Liberal Party but in fact to embarrass the Tory government.

He went on to say:

And I find that a strange commentary from a journalist and it certainly makes me suspicious about at least what part of their motivation may have been.

The Ottawa Citizen writes an editorial saying that what it is looking into is government ethics. I humbly suggest it should do a little consideration of journalistic ethics if that is not an oxymoron when applied to these people. They think they have Bernstein and Woodward here. What they have is researchers for the NBC program *Dateline*.

He said the purpose of these stories was not to seek out the journalistic goals of who, what, where, when and why, but to embarrass the Tory government. On the front page of this great national newspaper are stories by these two reporters who seek not the truth, who seek not to inform the public, but who seek by their own words to embarrass the government. Is that not wonderful? Are we not wonderfully served by such an institution?

Supply

This brought back to my mind a conversation I had with the late Marjorie Nichols. Speaking to me in some desolation one day—she had written an article that was actually complimentary about something the government had done—she said she was heckled and abused by her own colleagues in *The Citizen*. To write an article that actually said something good about the government was considered intolerable to her colleagues like Don McGillivray who has never had anything good to say ever about anything, even if he has to contradict himself. Then she also went on to say, in some disgust at the quality of the journalism around here: "You know, Harvie, this country has the strength to survive its politicians. It may not have the strength to survive its media". If this is the kind of standards we are going to get, these words are so true.

Perhaps a less pejorative interpretation could be put on those remarks which gets to another bigger problem. I was reading a review of the book: *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Service* by R. I. G. MacLean who at the time was working with the Ontario government on a two-year assignment. He was talking about bureaucracy and how bureaucracy stifles because bureaucracy is after process, process, process, process. It is not about results; it is process and how stifling it is. He made the following observation:

• (1610)

Each part of a bureaucratic organization has a mandate and operates within a set of rules. Lacking an objective assessment of outcomes, conformity becomes the measure of performance. This is what bureaucrats call accountability. The typical response to suggestions that we might get more done with fewer rules is that the rules are necessary for accountability to the public. This is a complete fallacy. The rules are all about accountability for inputs—the approvals required for spending. There is no accountability for outputs—what that spending achieves.

One bureaucrat was not following that procedure at least, Mr. Guité who was talking to Mr. Kennedy. He said: "Look, we followed a competitive process here. It is more honest than anything we did 10 years ago and *The Ottawa Citizen* is saying you did not provide a written report", i.e. the process. That was enough for them to conclude that the thing is corrupt and enough for them to continue in their ongoing efforts to embarrass the Conservative government.