

important that Canadians and Quebecers be aware of what goes on behind the scenes.

• (1340)

Another thing that struck me is how fast the contract was signed in the midst of last year's election campaign. The former Prime Minister hastened to sign this contract, this agreement, despite the current Prime Minister's election promise to cancel it. However, the same bunch of friends seem to be hiding behind all this. I think that Canadians and Quebecers have the right to know what is going on.

The other thing that bothers me is that, in the redevelopment and operation of Pearson Airport, the government had promised not to finance the modernization of Terminal 1. Nevertheless, it has apparently granted rent reductions worth several millions of dollars, which amounts to investing. It seems as though the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

The Nixon report also lists 10 unusual deductions for calculating gross revenue on which the rent is based. Again, are friends of the current and former governments pulling the strings to help themselves? For us, it is very important that all this be disclosed.

The other point, as there are two kinds of opposition in this country: Opposition members and the media. The *Toronto Star* also tells us that, according to its own research, the transaction would probably have triggered an increase in the per passenger cost related to the use of this airport. The increase would have been passed on to users. If it is a government responsibility to develop transport networks in Canada, I think that the government must assume the responsibility of facing Canadians and telling them that this transaction will result in increased costs to them, instead of relying on a friend to do that dirty job.

Let us say a word about this government which refuses to shed light on the issue and refuses to conduct an inquiry into that transaction. We are dealing with the transport sector. On Thursday, I must go back to my riding. I will sit on a rural dignity committee and listen to people who have things to say about railroad transport in Eastern Quebec, and specifically in my riding of Gaspé. This is an initiative taken by local people, because the government refuses to hold such hearings. As a member of the opposition, I agreed to sit on that committee and report back to Ottawa the grievances of those people.

But why does the government refuse to assume its responsibilities? People have things to say. We are talking about transport. Why do people in the Gaspé Peninsula have to take the initiative and set up their own committee, without the means available to a House committee, such as interpreters and a staff to type transcripts? They will do a very good job, but some people may

feel somewhat prejudiced by the way hearings will be conducted. Indeed, although I understand English, I cannot speak it as fast as those people. But I will be there and I wanted to point that out.

My time is running out. I will conclude by mentioning two major points which will more or less summarize what I said earlier. How did the previous government come to approve a project which goes totally against public interest? Are there interests other than the public's interest at stake, such as friends of the former and current governments?

We, Bloc Quebecois members, feel that a public inquiry is absolutely necessary in this case. The credibility of the government opposite depends on such an inquiry. If members opposite continue to hide behind closed doors and let lobbyists govern the country, you can understand that it will give us strong arguments for the upcoming referendum. Indeed, it will be very easy to say: Look, if you want to continue to live in a type of federation which lets lobbies make decisions, you can have it.

• (1345)

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to participate again in this debate on Bill C-22.

First of all, I would like to tell you how surprised I am to see a government that, just weeks ago, contended it was bound by a secret verbal agreement—more bounded than that, you choke—now be able to get out of a written, signed agreement.

I notice also that the government refused categorically to provide us with any information whatsoever, not one single document, on the verbal agreement regarding Ginn Publishing. In the case of the signed agreement between Her Majesty and T1 T2 Limited Partnership however, it produced a schedule attached to the bill listing 24 agreements and leases, as well as 7 other agreements and 19 other documents, for a total of 46 different documents. But again this was an agreement the Prime Minister had signed herself with her Minister of Transport.

How the government can so easily break that many agreements and leases while the Minister of National Heritage is incapable of getting out of a verbal agreement remains a great mystery to me, a mystery I hope we will be able to clear up someday.

That being said, I would like to address two questions: first, did the government negotiate a secret, possibly verbal, agreement with regards to compensation that could be paid under clause 10? Second, does the government intend to favour unduly, as it has in the past, Pearson Airport at the expense of other airports in the Toronto region and elsewhere in Canada?