

that a code of ethics should be adopted, and my colleagues in the House of Commons should be interested in promoting such a code.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who believe that only ministers and senior public servants can be involved in conflicts of interest. Having had a role in a minister's office which, as the hon. member mentioned, dealt daily with cases of future expropriation, I know that ministerial staff can be as involved in conflicts of interest as the minister himself, since during the course of their work, they have access to information that they could use to their own advantage or in such a way as to help other people they know to make profits.

I also do not believe that not being a cabinet member is reason enough to be excluded from this legislation. Many of us have had previous professional responsibilities in the business world, and the companies for which we used to work may—one day or even now—have negotiations with the government and make representations to obtain contracts and responsibilities. And the fact that we no longer belong to these companies does not exclude us from conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we really want to have a serious and non-partisan approach to this matter, we must consider it in its whole, we must consider the responsibility of political parties when they look for candidates, people who necessarily have had professional experience and interests in wide ranging economic activities. And the aim of most political parties when they want to be renewed is to call upon people who have proved themselves in the business or academic world or as professionals.

But to look for angels and to believe that candidates can be found who are immune from any conflict of interest is, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to oversimplify politics, which does not necessarily imply that political parties or individual members of the House have no responsibilities. But they can only assume those responsibilities if a code of ethics is actually adopted and if that code of ethics aims at both objectives I mentioned earlier, that is, first a normative objective that would consist in creating within groups, among people with public responsibilities, a certain set of values of honesty and of the services to be rendered primarily to the public. But I do not think we are doing Canadians a service if we try to keep this debate within the narrow limits of contributions that may have been received during an election campaign. We dealt with that problem especially during the 29th parliament when legislation was passed, but in the present situation, what we must establish within the public service, within the Parliament, is actually a set of values that would bring everyone to model his conduct after a service to the public which is not what we have witnessed in the past days.

I should like to report, Mr. Speaker, that in some countries—and I am thinking of Britain and the United States in particular—the intelligence of citizens was not insulted because not every minister and state secretary in the past had to disclose his interests. In my opinion, if we must seek a solution agreeable to all hon. members, we will really find it by giving up partisanship and by strictly keeping in mind the need to improve the relations which

hon. members of Parliament ministerial staff officials and ministers themselves will have with their constituents.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. It being 9.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to special order made Monday, December 9, 1974, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings to put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of the motion. The question, therefore, is on the amendment to the motion in the name of Mr. Stanfield. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Stanfield) which was negated on the following division:

● (2150)

(Division No. 11)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack	Gilbert	MacDonald (Miss)
Allard	Gillies	(Kingston and the
Andre	Graffey	Islands)
(Calgary Centre)	Halliday	MacKay
Baker	Hamilton	MacLean
(Grenville-Carleton)	(Qu'Appelle Moose	Macquarrie
Baldwin	Mountain)	Malone
Balfour	Hamilton	Marshall
Bawden	(Swift Current-	Masniuk
Benjamin	Maple Creek)	Mazankowski
Blackburn	Hargrave	McCain
Brisco	Hees	McCleave
Broadbent	Hnatyshyn	McGrath
Caouette	Holmes	McKenzie
(Villeneuve)	Huntington	McKinley
Carter	Hurlburt	McKinnon
Clark	Jarvis	Muir
(Rocky Mountain)	Johnston	Munro
Coates	Jones	(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Crouse	Kempling	Neil
Darling	Knowles	Nielsen
Dick	(Winnipeg	Nowlan
Dinsdale	North Centre)	Nystrom
Dionne	Knowles	Oberle
(Kamouraska)	(Norfolk-Haldimand)	O'Sullivan
Douglas	Lambert	Paproski
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-	(Bellechasse)	Patterson
The Islands)	Lambert	Peters
Elzinga	(Edmonton West)	Reynolds
Epp	Laprise	Ritchie
Firth	La Salle	Roche
Forrestall	Leggatt	Schellenberger
Fortin	MacDonald	Skoreyko
Fraser	(Egmont)	Smith
Gauthier		(Churchill)
(Roberval)		Stanfield