

PUBLIC SERVICE—NUMBER OF CONSULTANTS ENGAGED AS
OF NOVEMBER 15, 1974

Question No. 897—**Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain):**

1. As of November 15, 1974, what consultants were under contract to (a) the Office of the Prime Minister (b) the Privy Council Office (c) the Treasury Board (d) the Department of Agriculture (e) the Department of Communications (f) the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (g) the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources (h) the Department of the Environment (i) the Department of External Affairs (j) the Department of Finance (k) the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (l) the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce (m) the Department of Justice (n) the Department of Labour (o) the Department of Manpower and Immigration (p) the Minister of State (Fisheries) (q) the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs (r) the Department of National Defence (s) the Department of National Health and Welfare (t) the Department of National Revenue (u) the Post Office Department (v) the Department of Public Works (w) the Department of Regional Economic Expansion (x) the Department of the Secretary of State (y) the Solicitor General (z) the Department of Supply and Services (aa) the Department of Transport (bb) the Department of Veterans Affairs?

2. In each case, what is the (a) stated purpose (b) estimated cost of the consultation?

Return tabled.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Question No. 1,208—**Mr. Wise:**

How many pounds, cases, etc. of dairy products did Canada (a) have in storage (b) export (c) import during each year 1970 to 1973 inclusive?

Return tabled.

ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL BOARD—RADIATION SAFETY

Question No. 1,721—**Mr. Francis:**

How many people have been appointed to advise the Atomic Energy Control Board on radiation safety and what are their names?

Return tabled.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer the House to question 1,233 which has been on the order paper since the first day of the present session and asks for information concerning the \$200,000 swimming pool being constructed at 24 Sussex Drive. Specifically, it asks for the names of the donors, the circumstances surrounding the donations and other details concerning construction. These are matters which could very easily have been answered, yet several months have gone by without an answer being forthcoming.

Surely, it is a simple matter to have the government give this House a list of 25 names. The fact that these names have not been forthcoming can only lead us to the unfortunate assumption, at this stage at any rate, that there is something to hide. If there is no conflict of interest or impropriety involved, I would think that the Prime Minister could today assure the House that he will make public all details concerning the swimming pool immediately, and that failure on his part to do so might well indicate that there must be very good reasons for keeping the truth away from parliament and the public.

Mr. Trudeau: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there are very good reasons for keeping the facts from the

Order Paper Questions

House. I understand that those who offered to contribute were told that their names would not be made public.

An hon. Member: What have they to hide?

Mr. Trudeau: For fear that the House would say that I am receiving gifts from certain people and that I would be influenced by those gifts. I think the fact that their names are secret, not only to the House but to myself, certainly makes it very difficult for the House or the country to believe that I am being influenced by any form of gift.

I think the House will have to make up its mind. If the House wants me to be influenced, or to give the appearance of being influenced, by public donors, and the House passes a resolution to this effect, I will have the donors advised of this. If they want to have their names made public, it will be up to them. If they do not, I suspect it would be up to the treasury to foot the bill. This has also been suggested as the proper course.

I will be guided by the House, Mr. Speaker. If hon. members want the funds to come from the public treasury rather than from private and secret donors, that is perfectly acceptable to me except that they will then tell the taxpayers about this added expense that they prefer to see the taxpayers bear rather than have the government accept gifts, as it often does for the benefit of public property.

● (1430)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There appear to be other members who want to pursue the same point of order.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order to which the Prime Minister has just addressed himself. I should like to say on behalf of my colleagues that the line of reasoning the Prime Minister has taken is not one with which we are in agreement. It seems to me there is an important distinction to be made between gifts that are made to a prime minister while he is holding office—

Mr. Sharp: It is public property.

Mr. Broadbent: Perhaps the government House leader will hold on for a moment. There is an important distinction to be made between gifts made to a prime minister while holding office which he will take with him when he leaves office, and the kind of situation we have with a swimming pool being added to the official residence of the prime minister of Canada, and that includes prime ministers in general who will come after the present Prime Minister. There is an important point of public policy, which our party holds, that it is wrong in principle to accept private donations in this kind of situation whether the names are revealed or not. If a pool is required for some purpose, it should be government policy to put it in at public expense.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure that hon. members realize there is a great danger that with very little difficulty we could slip into a debate on this question rather than dealing with a point of order. The hon. member for