

### Government Orders

Today, a special committee is considering the future of the Seaway, but we are stuck with it, and it will probably cost too much to undo.

• (1610)

As an economic activity, transportation is central to many other activities. This is why maritime, rail, pipeline and air transportation play a role in the development capabilities of other economic activities. You can sense the appeal of that. This is clearly the reason why big investors, lobbyists and friends of the government are doing their utmost to lay their hands on this sector. Wolves follow their prey, and if we are not vigilant, private interest will prevail over public interest.

I will conclude by saying that for too long our taxes have been used against us in this federation. We no longer want our taxes to be used to enrich the friends of the government, we want them to be used to reduce the debt. The financing of our party, the Bloc Québécois, is a model to follow. Money comes from individuals, not from large companies or interest groups seeking favours by giving money to the main parties, irrespective of their leanings. We do not owe anyone anything, our hands are not tied.

We are here to defend Quebec's interests, and they include a sound management of public funds. This is why the Bloc Québécois is asking for a royal commission of inquiry. While waiting for Quebec sovereignty, we will try to improve Canada. Be assured that we are going to try to clean up its act.

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne):** Mr. Speaker, several questions have been raised since yesterday regarding the famous Bill C-22, an Act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport.

Several questions, to the total amazement of our friends opposite, had escaped them, not all of them though. Some Liberal members are more lucid than others, such as the member for York South—Weston, as demonstrated on page 3539 of yesterday's official report. I quote what he said:

I would submit that it would be unconscionable if they were paid any money whatsoever not only because of what was said during the election campaign, and what happened behind the scenes, but also because of the very clear statement and the request for proposals that was put out in March 1992. At paragraph (8.6.3.), it says this. Again Mr. Bronfman and all those who were participating in this contract were well aware of what was in the request for proposals.

It said: "All costs and expenses incurred by proponents relating to proposals will be borne by the proponents. The government is not liable to pay such costs and expenses or to reimburse or to compensate proponents in any manner whatsoever for such costs and expenses under any circumstances, including the rejection of any or all proposals and the cancellation of the project".

This paragraph shows very clearly that clause 10 of Bill C-22 makes no sense whatsoever, unless the minister, the Minister of Transport in this case, has to, heaven forbid, reward friends of his party.

Liberal members are surprised by our relentless attacks on this bill but what has happened to their commitment to transparency, now that they are six months into their mandate?

Among the promises which filled a whole chapter of the red book, what has happened to the ethics counsellor in charge of advising ministers, MPs and other public officials? The government could really use somebody like that, these days. What progress has been made in the drafting of a code of conduct for Parliament? It seems to me that it has fallen by the wayside.

What has happened to the new rules regarding lobbying? The Liberals will undoubtedly answer that it is a priority for them, but if we were to make a list of the priorities they have been talking about since January 17, I would feel sorry for issues that did not make it in their eyes because, for this government, everything is a priority, or rather, nothing is.

• (1615)

With respect to the new lobbying rules, we learned only yesterday from a report in *La Presse* that the federal government had decided to extend by one year very lucrative advertising contracts prior to establishing its new lobbying rules.

Clearly, there must be some mistake, Mr. Speaker. And yet, the government is now giving us the impression of taking care of its friends, before passing legislation to protect them, as I just mentioned. Perhaps we are mistaken, but the perception is rather different. And perception is the key to whether or not the public trusts the government. In this particular case, positions are relatively clear.

With your permission, I would like to quote the hon. member for Red Deer who stated the following yesterday, which appears on page 3529 of Hansard. I quote:

—I certainly agree with that. I would agree wholeheartedly with the member's comments that they know better and they obviously should not be expecting any compensation.

As you can see, I have introduced quotes from Liberal and Reform members who agree with our amendments, but none from Bloc members.

It is clear that Bloc members stand solidly behind this amendment, as do Reform members and even a few Liberals. Therefore, they have no business saying that we are being paranoid and that we are nitpicking.

Not so very long ago, in addition to the member for York South—Weston, the Minister of Immigration himself, the President of the Treasury Board and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry spoke out on this agreement. Even the