HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a distinguished parliamentary delegation consisting of five members of the Korean National Assembly, led by Dr. Paik Too Chin.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: As many hon. members will know, Dr. Paik served twice as prime minister of the Republic of Korea, before being elevated to the dignity of the Speakership.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I must say, however, that this last position Dr. Paik relinquished, to become chairman of the Yujonghoe group in the national assembly of his country.

[Translation]

Hon. members will recognize, I am sure, that this visit will help draw closer the bonds of friendship which now exist and have existed for a long time between the Republic of Korea and Canada.

[English]

I am sure that hon. members will hope and trust that this visit of our distinguished parliamentary colleagues will be both fruitful and useful.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF BACKGROUND PAPERS FOR WESTERN ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES CONFERENCES

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table in both official languages further background documents concerning the Western Economic Opportunities Conference. The final background document will be tabled later this week.

26446-69

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

STATEMENT BY MINISTER AND TABLING OF GREEN PAPER

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement with respect to conflict of interest concerning members of parliament. It is necessary for us as members of parliament to turn our attention from time to time to standards of conduct as trustees of public confidence, and to devise and re-examine rules and sanctions governing the behaviour of members of parliament so as to assure the people of Canada that private interests will not be allowed to take precedence over the public interest.

It is with this purpose in mind that I am tabling a green paper containing the government's proposals for a policy on conflict of interest as it relates to both Houses of Parliament. Part of the problem related to the controlling of conflict of interest is to define such conflicts, especially for the purposes of legislative expression.

The green paper confines itself to a discussion of the most easily recognizable and potentially most harmful area of conflict of interest, that involving private financial interests. In the paper, a conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which a member of parliament has a personal or a private pecuniary interest sufficient to influence, or appear to influence, the exercise of his public duties and responsibilities. The limitation of the definition to pecuniary interest is a practical limitation resulting from the need to be able to identify the conflict sufficiently to formulate legislation and rules. This green paper includes an analysis of the problem and a set of proposals as a first step in the evolution of formal standards.

The history of legislation in this field in Canada and in other jurisdictions indicates that two main approaches have been taken to the problem of control. One is avoidance, the other, disclosure. The proposals advanced in the green paper are intended to achieve three principal objectives. First, to curtail the abuse of public office; second, to eliminate, where possible, the appearance of a conflict of interest; and third, to suggest a set of guidelines in accordance with which all members will be expected to govern their behaviour.

• (1410)

We have divided conflict of interest into four areas. First, corrupt practices and prohibited fees; second, incompatible offices; third, government contracts; and fourth, financial interests.

The proposals recommend little substantial change in the presently existing law relating to corrupt practices. Bribery should certainly continue to be a criminal offence and should remain as part of the Criminal Code rather