

*Lobbyists Registration Act**[Translation]*

Therefore, I shall now put motions numbered 4, 6, 7 and 8 to the House which will be debated together but voted on separately.

*[English]*

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt)** moved:

Motion No. 4:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 11 and 12 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"(e) the fee charged by the individual for performing the activities described in subsection (1); and

(f) such other information relating to the".

Motion No. 6:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 30 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"graphs 5(1)(a) to (f), that employee shall,".

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell)** moved:

Motion No. 7:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out lines 38 to 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) the name of the employee;

(b) the name and address of the person or organization by whom the employee is employed; and

(c) the proposed subject-matter of the meeting or communication, as the case may be."

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt)** moved:

Motion No. 8:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"employed;

(c) the proposed subject matter of the communication; and

(d) the summary of the costs incurred by the person or organization while performing the activities described in this subsection."

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On debate, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria).

**Mr. Hawkes:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would just draw your attention to Motion No. 4. Looking at the lineage and the way it is worded, there are three words which complete a previous clause. I can see what the Hon. Member is intending but in the absence of those three words we would end up with a script which might not be what it should be. At least that is my reading of it. We can proceed with the debate but I think there is a technical problem which people might want to look into while we are proceeding.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Very well. On debate.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate at report stage of Bill C-82. Of course, I regret that not all motions were acceptable to the Chair but of course I accept the ruling in that regard. That leads me to debate Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and

8, and I want to address my remarks principally to Motion No. 7. That happens to be the one I proposed.

Bill C-82, as we know, offers a two-tier system of registering lobbyists. It says that there shall be a category of consulting lobbyists and from them we should ask certain information. For another category, the Tier II or so-called other lobbyists, we should ask merely the name and address of the person or organization by whom the employee is employed, and that the employee who files a return referred to shall as soon as practicable in the circumstances advise the registrar of any change. That is the only thing we are asking of those people.

In my opinion we are asking far too little of Tier II two lobbyists. I want to remind the House that the whole purpose of having a registration system is to offer some form of transparency. Of course, as it pertains to Tier I lobbyists, we will be asking for a bit more information and that is good. I think we should have gone one step further and asked to register the fees that lobbyists charge as well. However, that amendment being inadmissible, we obviously will not be able to ask that.

Nevertheless, the whole purpose of the exercise is to provide a certain transparency. In the case of Tier I lobbyists one could argue that there is at least an element of that which will be required of those so-called Tier I lobbyists or, in other words, consulting lobbyists. When we talk about consulting lobbyists, we talk about the GCIs and Frank Moores of this world.

As we deal with Tier II lobbyists, we are talking about a different kind of person. At least, the Government thinks we are talking about a different kind of person. We are talking about someone who, let us say, is the vice-president of government relations for General Motors or Inco or another similar company. That could be the definition of a Tier II lobbyist but it is not necessarily so. Let me give you the following scenario.

For example, say that a company has one of its vice-presidents as a Tier II lobbyist but that company does lobbying work for another company. I will give an example. Say we have a large corporate entity by the name of Imasco. That, of course, is a large corporate entity and owns a number of subsidiaries, one of them being Imperial Tobacco, another one being a cookie factory and so on.

● (1220)

In that situation there may be no transparency at all because if the lobbyist is working for the parent company, it will not be at all evident which one of the subsidiaries he or she is lobbying for because we are not asking enough information of the Tier II lobbyists. We are not asking from them the same thing that we are asking of Tier I lobbyists, namely, the subject of what the lobbying activity entails.

One could even argue that in the case of very large multinationals, the parent company could in fact be lobbying two completely diametrically opposed things, depending upon