

Government Orders

• (1155)

In his report, Mr. Nixon emphasizes: "This, together with the flawed process I have described, understandably may leave one with the suspicion that patronage had a role in the selection of Paxport Inc."

The Pearson Airport affair proves once again the need to review the law on the registration of lobbyists in order to stop scheming and patronage by certain lobbyists, including those who have ties to the party in power.

Knowing the Prime Minister, I hope he will order such a review as soon as possible. Besides, he has already committed himself to this in the Liberal Party's red book.

The people of Ontario, Quebec and Canada as a whole have a right to know what happened. You and I, all my colleagues and all taxpayers entitled to know if they will get their money's worth. When he says that "failure to make public the full identity of the participants in this agreement and other salient terms of the contract inevitably raises public suspicion," Mr. Nixon only touches on the problem. We parliamentarians must go one step further and let the people know what really happened.

Given the disturbing facts in this whole affair, we, members of the Bloc Québécois, ask for a public inquiry to get to the bottom of the whole situation. Refusing this inquiry, Mr. Speaker, will be interpreted as wanting to hide things and prevent taxpayers from knowing the plain truth. It is only by holding a public inquiry that we will be able to determine if compensation should be paid. And it is Parliament's duty to set the amount, if any. The public interest must prevail and guide our action.

Mr. Boudria: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to make sure that I understood well. I think I heard the hon. member accuse some members of this House of being in conflict of interest on the Pearson Airport issue. If I understood well the scope of the hon. member's words, you will realize, Mr. Speaker, that one cannot accuse other members of this House of committing illegal, and possibly, criminal acts and get away with it.

So, I would ask the hon. member opposite to explain exactly what he just said to us and, if he accused some members of this House, he should at least tell their names. Then, Mr. Speaker, you will take the action that you see fit regarding the people who make such accusations.

Mr. Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleague to reread my speech; I attacked the party, not the members.

Mr. Boudria: There is a fine line.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There seems to be a conflict of interest here. It depends on the circumstances; if one says that the other members committed some, let's say, criminal acts, that is one thing, but if one says that this is a conflict of interest in general, that is another thing. After hearing the hon. member's remarks, I think that this is an issue of debate,

because I did not hear an hon. member accuse someone else of a criminal act.

I will look at the blues. If there is another problem, I will be able to get back to this. For the time being, I think that the hon. member has concluded his remarks. Does he want to continue, because he has still—

An hon. member: He has finished.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Kilger): He has finished. Resuming the debate. I will then give the floor to the hon. member for Ahuntsic.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, during my last intervention in this House on Bill C-22, I had the opportunity to deal somewhat with the work done by some lobbyists and some friends of the government.

I will remind you particularly of the following names: Léo Kolber, Herb Metcalfe, Ramsey Withers, Ray Hession, Don Matthews, Fred Doucet, without mentioning the names of the companies and consortiums on behalf of which they interceded in this contract on the Pearson Airport privatization.

• (1200)

This is only the tip of the iceberg. I will spare you the list of the generous direct and indirect financial contributions made by all those people and firms to electoral funds of the Conservative and Liberal Parties.

So, what are we going to do about this tangle of ties woven over the years between those firms, their lobbyists and governments that follow one another and look strangely similar? One really has to bury his or her head in the sand to ignore the real political weight of all those people crawling around the government and within organizations of traditional political parties.

Lobbyists have learned how to influence governments. You will better understand why we demand not only a real act on lobbyists but also an act on the financing of political parties. An act that would prohibit any financial support from corporations and that would limit individual contributions, because by contributing judiciously to the electoral funds of the two main political parties, corporations are able to negotiate iron-clad contracts through their lobbyists. That way, each new government does not really have any choice but must honour those contracts or offer compensation, as it seems to be the case with the bill we are discussing today.

Bill C-22, with clause 10, brings into question the so-called openness of this government in this matter. What is the difference between the Liberal government and the previous Conservative government? There is very little difference.