

*Senate and House of Commons Act*

perfect example today of the pot calling the kettle black. The Liberals were great for spending money uselessly.

**Mr. Della Noce:** He was not there, he was working in the kitchen at that time.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Bill C-20 proposes to cut the wages of MPs and Senators by \$1,000.

**Mr. Boudria:** Not quite \$1,000.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** This is really a symbolic measure. I think every Member in the House would agree that if we really want to show some symbolism, this is an appropriate way to do it. However, I think members of the Canadian public will not be satisfied with mere symbolism. What they are really looking to Parliament for is leadership in terms of cutting expenditures, something about which the Government has declared itself in favour. They are looking to Parliament and saying: "How are you really taking care of our accounts? We want an accounting of your stewardship. We are not satisfied with symbolic cuts. When you say it is \$1,000 per MP and Senator, it could well be less than that". That is the crux of my remarks today. Since this is second reading debate and since we are dealing with principles, I wish to deal with the principle of symbolism.

Incidents which have occurred recently have cast doubt on the seriousness and validity of this symbolic wage cutting which Members of Parliament and Senators are being asked to support.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Tell us about the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) symbolism.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** We in this Party will not oppose the symbolism which is before us in Bill C-20. It is but flimsy symbolism which signifies really nothing. For the first time since I have been around here the Auditor General has just taken on a project which has not yet been built.

**Mr. Boudria:** It's half built.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** That's right, it is half built. The contracts that were tendered have been assigned, which is another process.

**Mr. Lewis:** Like roads.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** The people look at the prison which will be built in the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) riding and see that it will cost in excess of \$41 million to move the prison from where it was originally scheduled to be built in Drummondville to put it in place in the Prime Minister's riding. Canadians will look at that move and say: "He is the leader of the country. After all, he is the Prime Minister. What is the symbolism in that move? What is he saying to Canadians?" What he is saying is: "It's my skin and to heck with the costs". That is what he is saying. He is saying that he is more interested in saving his own re-election skin than in giving leadership to the country. Canadians will see all this foo-fa-

raw about wanting to cut Government expenditures and the deficit and see that in fact the Government is really only playing a shell game. On the one hand the Government is saying that MPs will take a \$1,000-a-year cut in pay and on the other hand, out the back-door go millions of dollars to save the Government's neck and the Prime Minister's political hide.

Another example in this respect is the ex-Minister who was accused of conflict of interest. He requested a judicial inquiry and the Government acceded to his request. Lo and behold we find out that the taxpayers of the country are picking up the tab for the ex-Minister's lawyer's fees of \$1,700 a day. That was a contract which was not tendered. Surely we could have gotten a lawyer for less than \$1,700 a day. Not only that, the Government has said that the ex-Minister's secretary must also have a lawyer, and the taxpayers will have to pay for those services as well. We should extrapolate that principle and apply it to each accused in the country for whom the taxpayers should pick up the tab.

Where is the symbolism in that action? Canadians are saying: "Look at those MPs. They are planning to take a \$1,000-a-year cut in pay and yet look at how they are handling the big bucks. They are just opening up the barn-door and shovelling it out."

I would now like to deal with the case of Mr. Dalton Camp. Why did he have to be put on the Civil Service payroll at over \$100,000 a year? Members of the Government could have received his advice free just by reading his column in *The Toronto Star*. Why did he have to be put on the payroll when for 35 cents on weekdays and \$1 on the weekends members of the Government could have received his advice? He does not bring any particular expertise with him concerning Government procedures. He is merely bringing political advice to save the Prime Minister's political hide and to save the hide of the Tory Government. That is what he is doing.

**Mr. Blaikie:** He's not doing it in western Canada, I can tell you that.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Where is the symbolism in paying Dalton Camp over \$100,000 a year, plus benefits?

**Mr. Blaikie:** John Diefenbaker is rolling over in his grave.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** In the same moment the Government erected a statue to the Chief. Members of the Government could not even bring off the dinner party.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Did you see the frown on that statue?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I sure hope the pigeons are having a hey-day out there.

**Mr. McDermid:** They wouldn't dare!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I will bet Hon. Members that the Government has even installed Dalton Camp in the Chief's old office. One could only imagine what the ghosts in the halls of this building are going through.