

Canadian Arsenals Limited

strange way for a public body to do business. I will come back to that point later.

We are also told that the Director General of Aerospace and Armaments, Stanley Kerr, who was a senior official of the Department of Supply and Services, left the Department of Supply and Services on November 1 to work for CFN Consultants, which was lobbying DSS on behalf of SNC, the company that is purchasing Canadian Arsenals. Mr. Kerr has signed an affidavit saying that he did not deal with any aspect of the CAL deal, but it still raises a question. It is the kind of question which Government Members would have screamed blue murder about when they were in opposition, screaming about conflict of interest.

I come to one interesting point, which relates to the rather strange bidding procedures that resulted in this one company being selected. We find in the *Toronto Sun* that SNC paid to a certain Member, who is the Minister responsible for regional development, a campaign fund donation directly, and that the company and the officers of the company have paid additional money to other Tory campaign funds, the central fund.

According to *La Presse*, they have paid \$10,000 to the Tory campaign. Of course, every politician seeks election donations, but when the election donations come to the people who have particular responsibility for a deal like this, from the people who turn out to be the beneficiaries of a deal like this, the public is entitled to ask some questions and get some answers. We want to know just who influenced the deal and who influenced this rather unusual procedure in the bidding. What was going on in the back rooms that influenced the way the value of money changed hands? The value of the work of the workers in that plant was being tossed around like a football.

As I said, it is the workers who created the value of that plant and the value of the products of that plant by their work. It is not the money wheelers and dealers who created that value but it is the money wheelers and dealers who want to scoop up the value. When some of them have made a point of providing election contributions to certain people who now have attained a high position in the Conservative Government, it is important to find out who, as a result of that, is scooping up the value that is created by people working in that plant. It may not be worth it to the Government, but it is well worth it to the people of Canada to take some time to look into these questions.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to elaborate again on some of the points that were made earlier by—

An Hon. Member: The same points you made last time.

Mr. Marchi:—myself and my colleagues. There are some Members opposite who, in the dying minutes of another parliamentary debate, do not like seeing members of the Opposition rising to make their points of view known. I have been sitting here since two o'clock carrying out my responsibilities and I believe I have earned my pay. I do not know

what Members opposite have been doing other than reading *The Toronto Star* and seeing that the polls are showing them down once again.

This is the national forum for debate and where political careers are made and broken. This is where we find out who can articulate concerns on behalf of their constituents. I am learning that it is simply a case of Members of Parliament from the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party who have any interest in or any sense of obligation and compassion for the representations we are receiving. Most important, those Members opposite are receiving the same representations, but the difference is that they are sitting on their representations while we are bringing them forth in the House of Commons, as is the intention of this forum.

My hon. friend and colleague, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), quoted from an April edition of *Business Magazine*.

Some Hon. Members: More.

Mr. Marchi: He quoted a number of interesting paragraphs from that magazine, and Hon. Members opposite are saying "more". The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier forgot to include in his quote that Mr. O'Toole from the privatization section of the Treasury Board said that the Government probably did not invest enough time in the entire stage.

When one considers that quote in conjunction with the subamendment, it gives credibility and life to that particular subamendment.

I will not stand here and suggest that I agree completely that we should delay this decision even though I disagree with the decision itself. If that decision has been made, I think we should inevitably come forth with it in the proper way. I am not prepared to suggest that it should be put off until 1989, because if we are serious about this issue and take into account why this particular firm is in business, we should have the responsibility of dealing with the situation in a responsible and forthright way.

That is why I would not support delaying this until 1989 simply for the sake of delay or waiting until the New Democratic Party is elected to Government, as suggested by the Member from the NDP. If that is the purpose, then it will not be 1989, but probably 3089.

Our purpose in rising is not to delay or procrastinate, but to allow the Government ample—I suggest that word wisely—opportunity to go back once again, as the magazine outlines, and do its homework correctly. The Government should do its homework on behalf of average Canadians, for a change. I say "a change" because it seems that this Conservative administration is concerned with everything else but the lot of the average Canadian.

● (1650)

It is fine for those Hon. Members to stand up and tell us that this is such a proud and profitable organization, but I do