

Supply

The agency of record ought to be eliminated. A government advertising bureau should be established within the government to handle government advertising contracts and to end the kind of despicable practices that we have been subjected to in recent weeks on the issue of the unity advertising.

I think the advertising bureau that I have just suggested should be placed under the auspices of the newly created department of government services. I believe that a new system for government advertising needs to be established to ensure non-partisanship and fairness.

The next point. An independent commission of inquiry should be established to mandate the present awarding procedures of contracts and tendering thresholds as outlined in the Treasury Board guidelines.

There are a number of things that should be changed, not the least of which is that we must increase the amount of control that we have right now over lobbyists in Canada. That is an issue that I will address in committee in a few moments from now.

• (1540)

Those are some of my and my colleagues' recommendations toward improving public sector ethics in this country. My colleagues will read more of these recommendations into the record in a few minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I listened to most of the speech of the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and I would have thought he would have expanded more on the motion before us today. It is an opposition motion. After all, it was presented by his party, but his speech contained mostly references to rather old newspaper articles. He mentioned names liberally and I think that is unfortunate.

I would also like to mention before asking my question that the opposition has the opportunity to hold a debate in the House about motions that it considers important ones. I am a young parliamentarian, but I think that we should use the time of the House to discuss subjects that are important for the country, for the nation, for taxpayers and for government itself. I realize this is not

what will happen today since between now and eight o'clock tonight, if the debate keeps going in the direction set by the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, I fear the time of the House will be spent very uselessly.

I would like to put a question to the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell: Could he tell me if he agrees with the methods used before 1988 by the party of which he is now a member, the party which formed government at that time? Does he agree with the methods used by the leader of the Liberal Party, which was the ruling party during those years, for nominating senators and various other officials to public functions?

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I am glad to hear the question of the hon. member. He referred to 1988. I think he meant 1984.

He is asking me if the system for Order in Council appointments in 1984 and prior was better to the one established since. No, of course not.

Mr. Blenkarn: So it is better now.

Mr. Boudria: No, it is the same. It has not changed.

The point is in 1984 the person who is now Prime Minister promised radical new measures to change those. He has done nothing of the sort.

The only thing we have had is an Order in Council review process that gives no power to a committee, not even the power to make a recommendation to the House of Commons under the Order in Council that happened.

If the minister across the way disagrees with that, I challenge him to go to the transcript of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations where he will see the motion that I proposed at the time to recommend to this House that Dalton Camp not be hired to work in the Privy Council Office. The motion was ruled out of order because there was no mechanism by which the committee could make that recommendation to the House.

Mr. Andre: You are talking about different things. It was a totally different thing.

Mr. Boudria: It was an Order in Council review.

Mr. Andre: No it was not. Be honest now.