As I sit in this House now I have a sense of my own personal view of what this standard should be, but I think we want to look to the Prime Minister for leadership.

We cannot do anything about these events after they happen. Once the crimes are committed that is it. We are not going to go back into the early education of people. We cannot do that in this House, in the formative years of MPs or anyone else in the country. We have to deal with these realities as they are now.

Therefore, I call upon the Prime Minister to articulate in this House the standard that he is setting for all of us in this House, not just government members but all of us.

The second item I want to address is patronage. This is covered by this opposition motion today. I can deal with it fairly succinctly. I am disappointed the promise that was held out to Canadians back in 1984 has never been fulfilled. I have two quotes. One was made by the Prime Minister in May 1983 and it has been referred to in the debate today. He did say there would be jobs for Liberals and the NDP too, after he had been Prime Minister for 15 years and could not find a living breathing Tory in the country. That was in May 1983. Later he did in a manner retract that and say he had been speaking to Tories at a convention. That may be true but it is on the public record.

• (1950)

Then he did make a fairly decent promise to the electorate in July 1984 when he said: "The method of making appointments could be corrected by dramatic measures. We are going to bring in a brand new dimension to them of objectivity, representation and fairness for all Canadians".

My goodness, that is just about exactly what he did do. He did do it in a dramatic fashion. These are not my words but several years later, in 1987 it was written in *The Globe and Mail* that: "If Brian Mulroney has a single friend who has not been appointed to a board, commission, or agency, or has not been awarded the title of Queen's Counsel, or has not been given a fat contract or Senate appointment, that friend deserves to be annoyed".

The promise of rectitude, the promise of reform, the promise of doing things differently, the promise of making appointments, always quality appointments have

Supply

never been fulfilled in this place. I will be honest. I am less concerned about patronage appointments that are quality appointments. Just because a person is of the same political stripe as the government it should never disentitle somebody from being appointed. I and all Canadians want appointments to be quality appointments.

About three years ago one of my colleagues tried to measure the balance in the appointments. At the time the reference was roughly one in 100 appointments that was not a Tory. I cannot personally verify that. That is second-hand information, but somebody made a reasonable attempt to measure that and that is not good enough. Canadians expect there to be more quality appointments available outside the realm of the Progressive Conservative Party.

I know from time to time the Prime Minister makes a big deal about the odd appointment that is not Tory. There have been some of those and I accept that. I do not think he has ever fulfilled the promise he held out to Canadians seven or eight years ago.

As I see it there are two bottom lines in the way these appointments should be made. The first is that we demand quality. The second is that we require accountability in the appointment process. We need to ensure that when appointments are made they are reviewed by the House in some mechanism, by committee. Appointments can be reviewed to a great extent by committee but most committees do not have enough time to get around to them. We have the job to improve on that. There is no mechanism to set aside the appointment but just to review it. So there they are: quality, we insist on it; accountability and review of the appointment, we insist on that.

I do not think people are going to believe the Prime Minister any more when he talks about his promise of accountability and fairness in the appointment system.

The third area I want to talk about is that of the lobbyists. Today several speakers from both sides of the House have discussed what is becoming a very serious public interest issue for Canadians. Many Canadians frankly are not aware of how serious it is.

We need to know who is dealing with whom on public policy issues and on government business and contract issues. We do not know that well enough now. There is a need to regulate further the lobbying efforts that affect government decisions.