

*International Development Research Centre*

a bill with great reservations, as anyone who was on the committee knows. We struck out the words "a member of the House shall be appointed" and put in the words "a member of the House may be appointed", which could be done in any event without this amendment. We added superfluous language to the bill in order to indicate that, perhaps under certain circumstances, it might be a good idea to appoint a member of the House to this board.

Following that, the bill went to the Senate, and the Senators said that, "since this House thinks one elephant is a good thing, we will have two or three". The Senators are acting very much like the proverbial Hollywood director of the twenties, who thought one elephant was a good thing, a whole herd of elephants was a great deal better.

It is quite clear that the Senate have introduced an amendment which would result in the Senate insisting, if a member of this House were appointed to a board, on a Senator being appointed as well. That is a bad approach. This position is not a plum or a nice little job to be handed out to a member of the Senate or a member of the House simply because we think it would be nice. It is a working job, which needs a qualified person. Anybody reading the words of the Senate amendment will realize that the Senate amendment is motivated by the wrong approach. This is the wrong type of amendment to insert in the bill.

The dilemma described by the hon. member for York South is that if we vote against the amendment we will tie up valuable time in sending the matter back to the Senate for reconsideration. The matter would then have to return here for further debate. Therefore, it was with great pleasure that I heard the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) say this afternoon that he intends to regard these words, which include the word "may", as permissive only. He will be governed entirely by that. Indeed, he went further and indicated he has no intention of appointing either a member of this House or a member of the Senate to the board without very careful consideration. I think this is a wise attitude in the light of the Senate amendment.

The committee of the House made a change that was very tentative and permissive. We realized that there would perhaps be occasions when it might be desirable to have a member like the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), who has had great experience in the field of international development, sit on

[Mr. Anderson.]

this particular board. The bill was sent to the Senate and they clearly misread our intentions. Now, the bill has come back to the House, and by a decision of the minister, who has taken a very firm stand on this question, we are back to the point from which we started. It will, therefore, do no harm to leave this particular clause in the bill. Ideally, it would be better to scrub the whole thing at this point, and get rid of it. However, the procedural difficulties that we are faced with will make me, like the hon. member for York South, keep my mouth closed when the amendment comes to a vote. I do not intend to vote for the amendment.

However, I think the principle that we introduced in the committee should not be entirely lost, even though the Senate has unfortunately treated this matter as it should not have been treated. I still feel that the original amendment proposed by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) had certain merit. Not every board should have a Member of Parliament on it. Neither should every commission. However, there are occasions when the service of a member on such a board, commission or other body might be desirable.

• (2:30 p.m.)

In putting forth this amendment in committee, we simply raised the suggestion that perhaps this was an area where a member might be appointed. I hope the fact that the minister has quite rightly decided, in the light of the Senate amendment, not to appoint members of Parliament to this particular board will not result in the idea being abandoned. I hope in future, under certain circumstances, the government will reconsider, and regard Members of Parliament as first-class citizens, just as able and capable of being appointed to boards as any other citizen in this country, or as in this very particular case a citizen of any other country. I do not think we should be barred from such service just because we hold office here. I hope this unfortunate development which has taken place with regard to this particular bill will not result in the idea being lost for the future.

**Mr. Thomson:** Will the hon. member permit a question? Where will a Member of Parliament find time to serve on these boards?

**Mr. Anderson:** The hon. member has asked where a Member of Parliament will find the time. If we were not serving on committees of the House, we would probably say that we do not have time for committees. Some hon.