

*Adjournment Debate*

and are in the lower tax brackets or too much to even qualify. That reduced the figure to about \$500 million.

They gave no credit for the creation of child care spaces. I wonder whether or not the parliamentary secretary would agree that if the government is prepared to spend \$12,000 per space to create child care spaces, some credit ought to be generated by those who free up those spaces.

The government used figures when it discussed with me in the worst possible case. This is the fiscally responsible thing to do. I hoped there would be some movement, some understanding that in fact there is real value for work in the home to be recognized. It is an honourable profession. Some tax reform is going to be necessary sooner or later. I want to assure the House that I for one am not going to stop fighting on behalf of all caregivers, whether they be parents working in the home, the seniors, the chronically ill or the disabled.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

### [Translation]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

#### PARTY FUNDRAISING

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, last March, when I supported the motion of the hon. member for Richelieu on the financing of political parties by individual contributions only, I said then that attitudes had changed and that people were now willing to accept major changes in the way political parties were funded.

This is still my opinion and, even though the motion from my colleague was defeated, many among the hon. members of this House are willing to democratize our electoral system.

The vote was significant, since 85 members from all political parties sided with the hon. member for Richelieu and asked for a modernization and cleaning up of our political practices. They, too, wanted an end to an influence peddling which is always unsound in a democracy. They no longer accept that conflicts of interest interfere in Canadian political life. Like the hon. member for Richelieu, they asked this House to legislate, once and for all, on the financing of federal political parties to limit contributions to private individuals.

That was their reason for supporting the motion. They will not be able to do what some Liberal members from Quebec did the last time, that is reject the motion offhand or abstain, like the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, refus-

ing to take side. This is a disgraceful and unforgivable behaviour, especially coming from Quebecers familiar with the provincial legislation and in a good position to judge its effectiveness as a basic means of political democratization—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. Does the hon. parliamentary secretary wish to raise a point of order? I am sorry, points of order are not allowed during adjournment proceedings. The hon. member can go on.

• (1835)

**Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I recognize in you an upright and honest man who assumes the responsibilities of his position. That is to say that if those members have voted against the motion, it is because they still support the slush funds, rewards for services rendered and permanent conflicts of interest.

Those members see nothing wrong in the fact that T'Ang Management Limited, a company on which we have no information, gives generously—and I would ask the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands to listen carefully to this—\$216 000 to a political party present in this House. They see nothing wrong in the fact that the Royal Bank of Canada and the Toronto Dominion Bank gave this year \$192,300 to the Conservative Party and \$166,300 to the Liberal Party. Those members approve the contributions made by Dominion Securities, Wood Gundy and Richardson Greenshields, who gave three quarters of a million dollars to the two old political parties, that is \$447,700 to the Conservatives and \$304,500 to the Liberals opposite.

And this is only the tip of the iceberg. Mr. Speaker, if you will give me just a few seconds, because you have sort of cut my time earlier. Canadians are not taken in. They know full well that a political party who receives thousands and thousands of dollars from those financiers will have to give them thousands and thousands of services at the expense of the collective wellbeing.

In conclusion, we often hear that members of Parliament have no credibility left. It is aberrations like these that kill our credibility. As a member whose hands are free, I resent these malversations by members who collect hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars from one source.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, as I told the member for Frontenac, I have great trust in your ability in the Chair, but the problem is that in the course of his remarks he commented on the way one hon. member voted and this is contrary to the Standing Orders of the House. I am quite sure that it is not allowed.

In any event, I have the pleasure to answer a question he raised in this House a few days ago. I respect the vote of the members who supported the setting of a \$5000 ceiling on private contributions to federal political parties as well as the limitation of financing by corporations. However, the motion presented by his colleague and put to the vote on September 20, 1994 was