

me what the reasons were I would be glad to contribute my view. I will not even mention his arrogance or his career in the Public Service in which he assumed authority beyond the scope ever intended to be assumed by any public servant. He was defeated in the election, and that verdict has my complete endorsement. Did Mr. Coutts quit and go off into so-called honest employment? No, Mr. Coutts could not give up the kind of activities he had pursued while he was in government on the public payroll. Instead, he established himself in the riding of Spadina in Toronto as a sort of super-parliamentarian or extracurricular parliamentarian. He was defeated, but he continues to reside in Spadina notwithstanding the fact that he claims to be a former resident of Alberta and to have lived in other parts of Canada, including Ottawa.

According to this public report by Lawrence Martin which appeared in our so-called national newspaper, Mr. Coutts is the man to contact if you need some help in Ottawa, where he still maintains an apartment. A Mr. Chen wanted to get his father to Toronto from Hong Kong and got hung up in red tape. The article reads:

Call Jim and he'll call Immigration Minister Lloyd Axworthy. When Jim calls, people such as Mr. Axworthy still listen.

The article goes on to say exactly how that immigration case was settled and how the subject of it got into Canada—just because Jimmy Coutts called Lloyd Axworthy. apparently there is no law on record that says to Jimmy Coutts and the former Minister of Employment and Immigration, now the Minister of Transport, that they simply cannot get together on the telephone and decide who shall come into Canada and who shall not according to their own ideas and attitudes.

Clause 3 of Bill C-208 would make it a conflict of interest when a Cabinet Minister gives preferential treatment and privileged access to a former employee and officer of the Government. It is a shame that there is no legislation on the books that would prohibit that kind of action on the part of a Cabinet Minister and a former government official. If we only pass this one provision of Bill C-208 it would stop Mr. Jim Coutts from calling a Cabinet Minister, as reported in this article and in other places, and getting preferential treatment. Is it too much to ask the Parliament of Canada to pass a law to stop that kind of activity forever so that no person in the country will get special treatment simply because of a relationship that existed in the past and is projected into the future?

I will not even give advice to Liberals—perhaps they do not want it—but I would ask them if they want a man like James Coutts as the leader of their Party, a man who goes to Toronto and sets himself up in the constituency of Spadina as a kind of super-parliamentarian. It is not enough that he calls Cabinet Ministers and gets immigration cases fixed, now he wants to become leader of the Liberal Party. I hope they make him leader of the Liberal Party because then all Canadians will see what kind of person he is. I will not have to stand up in the House of Commons and list the mischief he has performed in the country and the arrogance he has shown for the governmental process over the years. If the Bill stops that preferential

### *Government Affairs Control Act*

treatment then it will serve the interests of Parliament and of Canada.

There are many other cases that have come to light that demand this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker. I want to refer to the travesty that took place in February or March of 1983 and which was evident in the House of Commons by the "Coalgate" affair. It involved a former Minister of the Crown, Alastair Gillespie, who, notwithstanding so-called guidelines issued by the Prime Minister, set out to obtain a very special kind of contract with the Crown. He did this with the full knowledge of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) who was at that time Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and with the full knowledge of other Members of the Government. When the case was brought to light they said that the guidelines were just voluntary and that he did not have to observe them. They clearly prohibit the kind of arrangement made by Mr. Gillespie, but apparently they are only voluntary guidelines and if Mr. Gillespie does not see fit to observe them there is nothing the Government can do.

There was a hue and cry from Members of the Progressive Conservative Party and of the New Democratic Party, and together we brought a resolution to the House demanding that a parliamentary committee inquire into the subject and set guidelines. It was defeated by the Liberal Government. Instead, it appointed a task force to establish conflict of interest guidelines and a code of conduct. It is supposed to report by the end of 1984. It will be interesting to see what it says, but if it does not bring forward recommendations to stop the Coutts type special treatment or the Gillespie type nibbling at the public purse, then its work will have been useless.

There are provisions in the Senate and House of Commons Act and in the Canada Elections Act governing the qualifications of Members of Parliament and the Senate. I can give you a horrible example of that, Mr. Speaker. In the Constitution Act it is set out very clearly that if a Senator is convicted of a felony, a serious offence, he or she must vacate the seat. We have such a case in the Senate of Canada. We have a Senator who was convicted under the Criminal Code of Canada who still sits in the Senate, who was fined \$25,000, who could pay that fine two or three times over from the amount he has received in Senate compensation since he was convicted, but nobody is the least concerned about it. I can tell you that the people of Canada are worried about that kind of mischief, Mr. Speaker. They recognize that there ought to be a law that Members of Parliament, Senators, Cabinet officers and all government officials should not be allowed to get away with a standard of conduct lower than the standards that prevail in the private sector among ordinary people. Quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker; the public insists upon parliamentarians and members of Government having a standard higher than normal.

I have presented Bill C-208 which deals with one aspect of the problem, Mr. Speaker. I am not asking the Parliament of Canada to pass that measure; all I want is that it be referred to a committee so that we will at least recognize that we know a problem exists. We know that the public demands high stand-