

sure that it represents a minute fraction of what it costs to manage a \$5.2 billion industry.

And while we are asked to make an act of faith, to write a blank cheque, to give our support, we are denied the very tools we need to do our job.

• (1625)

Is this what you call being transparent? All I can say is that in the riding of Gaspé, this is definitely not transparent.

I would also like to comment on standards governing the awarding of these contracts. As far as I can see, there are no uniform standards. It seems that the only existing rules are internal to each department, but they are easy to get around and, most of all, they are far from being clear. Since there are no uniform rules, no limit on the use of outside resources, contracting-out is taking place in an unhealthy and vague environment.

A modern government should do business the modern way. So far, so good. Contracting-out is one such modern methods. I am not questioning the use of contracting-out, but the fact remains that one has to know how to use this tool and that any new idea can lead to abuse. Hence the need to use contracting-out cautiously so that it will not become an instrument of corruption. I think we should give ourselves the means to oversee contracting-out.

This means that the government must clearly state its policies in that regard and explain how it plans to implement them. To set rules is one thing, but to ensure they are implemented and complied with is another. I see nothing to that effect in here.

This bill clearly missed the point in our view.

There are other inequities. I noted two, the juiciest ones in my opinion, as you can imagine.

For example, I am informed that only 15 per cent of all federal contracts were awarded in Quebec. Fifteen per cent, Mr. Speaker. But there is another figure to which I would like to draw your attention because for us, in Quebec, the Outaouais is a region dear to our hearts. It is an integral part of Quebec but, sadly, according to two thirds of the Quebec electorate, at the federal level, this region is an orphan. I want to tell the people of the Outaouais that only one per cent of all federal contracts awarded in the National Capital Region go to the Quebec side of the Ottawa Valley. Unfortunately for them, they do not have a Bloc Québécois member to stand up for them. Maybe someday!

These two examples speak volumes, but I could go on, There is a long list, but I can see that time is running out. I will therefore move on and make a few constructive suggestions which, I hope, will help the other side improve on their bill. I have not talked about any clauses because we are asking that the bill be totally reworked.

### *Government Orders*

I have three constructive proposals: first, a political review committee on contracting out; second, a contracting-out code; and third, a consultation process for members, who are, after all, accountable to the people for the budget and for management activities. In this regard, it is very important.

You now ask me: What would be the powers and especially the characteristics of this political committee? It could, for instance, be made up of people who can get involved. What does this mean? It could include experts in government administration processes and members from all political parties.

• (1630)

It would have the power to inform and especially to protect the public interest, since we are all working for the people. It would also have the power to issue regular public reports to ensure government openness, without having to wait for someone to go look somewhere for this report, assuming he can find the right subject. There is no openness, at the present time. The report could be indexed by riding. As far as I know, Gaspé people do not live in Ottawa-Carleton. These things should be straightened out. As my grandmother used to say, "The white socks with the white socks, the black socks with the black socks". Things must be straightened out; we should show respect for the people by putting everything in the right place.

Cases for contracting out should be clear and clearly defined in the bill, which could be used as a working tool by the review committee. Members should be consulted because they are the ones who pass the laws and who must face the people. Since they represent different political parties, they should also be consulted on this kind of thing.

In conclusion, we want a little more openness here in Ottawa. Earlier, some members said that, as sovereignists, we play the bad guys from time to time. But we hope that Canada, which will still be our neighbour when Quebec becomes sovereign, as I firmly believe, will be well run, because in business, what is better than dealing with someone who runs a clean business.

I would like to say something else about the credibility of parliamentarians. As MPs, we stand to gain from this exercise of openness. The red book said that, but it is starting to fade. Very few of its promises seem to be kept.

I want to quote what the red book says, on page 91, about the credibility of parliamentarians: "If government is to play a positive role in society, as it must, honesty and integrity in our political institutions must be restored. The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable." Mr. Speaker, let me say that the French version of the Liberal Party's red book contains a mistake when it says: "—tout en étant comptable de ses actions—" I understand that they meant the English word "accountable", which in