

very special things that our government has done to be fair. It is a total difference from this black and bleak picture that the member has presented to the House.

The second thing the government did was to introduce a tax credit. This makes it a fair system for Canadians who are on low incomes, the very people he is speaking about. Under this new system, households with families with incomes of \$30,000 or less are going to be better off than they are under the existing manufacturers' sales tax. As a result of this reform coming through right now, some 84 per cent of seniors will receive the GST credit. That is 84 per cent who will be receiving that cheque every three months to help them offset the cost of paying it. About 75 per cent of households that are headed by seniors or single parents are going to be better off. One cannot make those exemptions without drawing a line.

If everything was going to be taxed, there would be no differentiation between what is on one side of the line and what is on the other. Once it is said that these core things such as prescription medicines, basic groceries, residential rents and exempt them, then clearly there has to be a line of division. This is common sense and this is the way the law works.

For the hon. member to stand up and parade the case of Aspirin or a few other things that may be on the other side of the line and in so doing try to engender fear among the senior citizens of this country, is an outrage to the common sense of those good people. It reminds me of the same kind of fear-mongering that was heard from them in the last election campaign when they told the seniors of this country that under free trade trade, they were going to be losing their medicare. Medicare is still here. Also, that they were going to be losing all kinds of other goods services. Those services are still here.

MEMBER OF THE SENATE

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the adjournment debate this evening on a subject that was before the House approximately one year ago. I think that *Hansard* shows it as November 6. That is almost so long ago, I can hardly remember. Having to look back that far, it is hard to conjure up the adrenalin that perhaps I had at that time in addressing the issue in Question Period.

### *Adjournment Debate*

The question has to do with whether or not the government had conveyed to parties interested in reviewing a matter, the matter of whether or not a senator had breached either a statute, the Parliament of Canada Act, or conflict of interest guidelines. I had asked whether or not the government was able to provide to those who would investigate, and here I was thinking of the RCMP or any other agency that would have looked at the matter, a list of law firms that had been doing business with the Federal Business Development Bank. I would have expected the government to respond in good faith and say yes, we have or no, we did not or we cannot, but the government did not. The government's response was that my question should have been made part of the Order Paper, as a Question on the Order Paper. Needless to say, I was not very happy with that because I did not ask for the list. I was not fishing for the list. I wanted to know that the government was co-operating, in good faith, with those whose jobs required them to investigate that particular issue. That is why I rise in the House now to raise the issue again and place it on the public record here in Parliament.

The matter involved a public record that showed the amount of \$104,000 had been paid to a law firm in which the senator involved was a partner or associate. It seemed pretty reasonable to me to ask whether or not that law firm was on a list and what types of business that law firm had transacted, in retainer, for the Federal Business Development Bank.

I was curious as to how a party who was a lawyer—and although the hon. senator is one with whom I work on a committee, I have not asked him personally but I think the question was certainly addressed here in the House—could have been unaware, as a lawyer, of some of the particulars of the statutes that were being spoken of at the time. At the time, I wanted members of the government to stand up and acknowledge the facts, as they were on the public record, and say that it would take a look at them.

A whole year has passed. I did not bother to ask for the list after the reply was given to my question, but I know there is a list because I and individuals with whom I worked back in the early 1980s were on the list. I was on a list of lawyers who did work for the Federal Business Development Bank in rotation. I will say that I did not