

any contract awarded by the government should be open to public scrutiny.

Surely members of Parliament must be excluded from any involvement in the contract awarding process.

There should be established within the House of Commons a non-partisan nominating and confirmation procedure for Order in Council and other appointments.

• (1640 )

Right now if an Order in Council appointment is referred to the energy committee, of which I am a member, we have no right to stop the appointment. We can have a little hearing. We can ask questions. My understanding is that whether we like it or not once the Order in Council is signed that man or woman is appointed and it is, in effect, just window-dressing for these committees to pretend to review these appointments.

If this Parliament is going to regain a meaningful place in society we should be able to scrutinize the appointments of deputy ministers and of appointments to Crown corporations and certain regulatory agencies.

We should also have the right to veto appointments as we saw happen recently south of here in the case of the proposed attorney general, Ms. Baird.

There should be no registration fees imposed on Tier I and Tier II lobbyists. Individuals should be free to petition and give feedback to public officials. Professional lobbyists should be required to disclose in a public registry their major expenses and fees along with a description of their lobbying activities. Contingency fees are simply unacceptable for lobbyists.

I think I have probably said enough. If I made one point I hope it is that Canadians are very, very angry. Any of us who goes door knocking in our ridings knows how angry Canadians are at us about our pensions and perks. There is a constant stream of newspaper articles describing abuse of office or worse.

### *Supply*

The only way we are going to regain the public trust is by introducing very tough ethics in a government act which will basically do what the United States Congress did after Watergate.

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Madam Speaker, the member recited a great number of articles alleging all sorts of nastiness.

I noticed that all of those articles were in the period prior to 1988 when the member ran for the Progressive Conservative Party in the last general election, and he certainly knew about them at the time. Having known about all these terrible revelations why did he put his name up and accept the letter from the Prime Minister to make him a candidate in that election on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party?

If he was really concerned about these terrible ethical matters that he has revealed today he would not have run for the party that allegedly made these terrible errors, would he? Maybe he can explain to this House why he accepted the Prime Minister's nomination in 1988.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Madam Speaker, when I was expelled from the caucus after the GST vote the Prime Minister was quoted as saying that he would not sign my nomination paper if I attempted to run for the party again.

I assured him that he would never have that problem because as long as he was leader of the party I would never have anything to do with the Conservative Party.

I would remind the member for Mississauga South that in 1986 when I "left the caucus" for a period of nine months two reasons were given. They were the abuse of office by the government of the day and the lack of attention to the problems in the west.

I have some affection for the member. He may not want me to say that in public but if there were more members on that side of the House who had the candour and the outspokenness of the member who just spoke this place would be held in more esteem than it is at present.

One of the troubles with his caucus is that there are too few people like the member who are prepared to say what is on their minds either in here, in the caucus or