

What are you going to do about the technological impact research fund? Because I will tell you, the people who receive eight of 13 grants awarded so far—

Mr. Althouse: That's what they are, grants.

Mr. Hawkes:—eight of the 13 untendered contracts are with unions or employee associations and, in many cases, those people may be related. I do not know who the brothers-in-law sisters-in-law, third cousins and second cousins are. I do know that many of the board members will have supported NDP candidates in the last election. And I ask the members of the New Democratic Party: do you really mean that their participation on behalf of your candidacy in a democracy should exclude them from participating in an area of human activity where they are particularly well suited, are particularly expert, and where we have good reason to believe they will produce the best product for the least cost for the Canadian taxpayers? That is what those groups are and we think they should be funded.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hawkes: Those Hon. Members sit in some kind of vaporous land, Mr. Speaker, without having their feet on the ground. We have an untendered situation with all of the banking that we do on behalf of the federal Government with the credit unions and major banks. We have an untendered situation with every professional service, whether we are talking about accountants, lawyers, or consultants of one kind or another. How on earth could we have a tendered situation in the area of artists and entertainers?

● (1640)

Mr. Deans: You're being ridiculous.

Mr. Hawkes: We're being ridiculous? The NDP House Leader (Mr. Deans) says that we are being ridiculous. Mr. Speaker, as our House Leader has pointed out, we are spending the better part of \$5 million on this debate today. We are debating a situation in which the Government of Canada picked a provider of goods and services and paid him \$26,000. All of the work was done. There are no complaints about it. And we got an extra service which will save the taxpayers \$500,000 this year, next year and the year after that. They find that appalling, Mr. Speaker. They want us to spend \$5 million debating the terrible Government that chose the best supplier in the country which did the best job. Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with their logic.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, we are running out of time and there is so much more that I would like to say. I have sat in this Chamber for six years. One of the characteristics of legislation brought in by the previous Government, and nine times out of ten supported by the NDP, was the creation of boards, commissions, and mechanisms that would allow Order in Council appointments.

Supply

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the hon. gentleman said we should stick to the facts, would he admit that his Party supported about twice as many of the Liberal votes—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I am sorry, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, Members will remember that spate of appointments just prior to the election. I do not want to bring up the names of all the former Members of Parliament who were appointed to boards and commissions, but there were three appointments to ambassadorial posts, one of them new. There were five appointments to courts, one to the Parole Board, one to the Canadian Radio and Television Commission, one to the Canadian Transport Commission, one to St. Lawrence Seaway, one to the Livestock Feed Board, and one to the Aviation Safety Board. There were other appointments to de Havilland, to the Export Development Corporation, to the Canadian National Railway, to the Canadian Sealing Industry, and to the Farm Credit Corporation. That is just a partial list. I bring that up to remind the House that in the minority Government of 1972 to 1974 the thrust of the NDP public policy was toward the creation of boards and commissions which would operate at arm's length from the Parliament of Canada and would allow the Cabinet to make appointments and spend money without telling the Canadian people very much about them.

That is the thrust of public policy in the country. It grows out of an ideology which says that there are elites designed to rule. At the heart of this motion today is a threat system to Canadians. The threat is that if you happen to have a friend or business partner who happens to marry someone who happens to be related to someone who gets involved in politics, part of your business can go down the drain. Therefore, you had better not get involved as a volunteer, you had better not encourage your family to get involved as volunteers, and you had better not participate in democracy. Let the elite rule. That is the thrust of this.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): It being 5.45 o'clock p.m. it is my duty to interrupt these proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of Supply in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 62(9). The question is the following one. Mr. Deans, seconded by Ms. Jewett, moves:

That, in the opinion of this House, the granting of an untendered contract to the brother-in-law of the present Minister of Finance by the Government of Canada is an unacceptable action.

It is the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): All those in favour please say yea.