The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to let the member finish?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Agreed. The member for Joliette has again the floor.

Mr. Laurin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had reached August 30, 1993, when the Minister of Transport in the Conservative government announced that a general agreement had been reached with the Pearson Development Corporation concerning the management of all three terminals at the Lester B. Pearson Airport. What is Pearson Development Corporation?

It is a corporation specially created to manage the three terminals and that incorporated all the activities of T1 T2 Limited Partnership. This new company was also controlled at about 17 per cent by the Matthews Group—Matthews being the chairman of Paxport—at 66 per cent by Claridge Properties, allied to Mr. Bronfman, and at 17 per cent by public companies which were to provide conventional airport services.

You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this structure closely resembles the one of T1 T2 Limited Partnership. On September 8, as we all know, a general election was called by the Government of Canada.

It is then, and only then, that Mr. Jean Chrétien, the Prime Minister to be, warned that he would not hesitate, once in office, to cancel that deal if completed. Following this statement, the chief negotiator requested written instruction to sign the contract and, on October 7, Prime Minister Campbell demanded that the legal privatization document be signed that very day.

Three days after the general election, on October 28, the Prime Minister appointed Robert Nixon as special investigator to scrutinize the privatization of the Pearson terminals.

At this point, we should note that Robert Nixon was Treasurer of Ontario in the Liberal government of Premier Peterson, and had been leader of the Ontario Liberal Party.

On November 29, Mr. Nixon delivered the report on his findings, opinions and recommendations to the Prime Minister who decided to cancel the privatization deal on December 5.

The government may want to show its good will by passing Bill C–22 which cancels the deal, but how is it that the Liberal Party never denounced the situation while they were in opposition, and while all these dubious dealings were unfolding before their eyes? Why did the Liberal Party not denounce its political friends and those of the Conservative Party who were gearing up for such favouritism?

Why is the Liberal Party still seeking today to protect its political friends by closing this case in such a way that it will punish the bad Tories who were party to these transactions, but compensate its good Liberal friends who were involved to the same degree in this murky deal?

Why are the Liberal Party and its financial supporters afraid of revealing the hidden side of this privatization?

Why is the Prime Minister still refusing to order a royal commission, the only way to get to the bottom of things?

If such an inquiry is not called, the Bloc Quebecois will not side with the Liberal government and will not support this bill which is as unacceptable as the airport privatization deal itself.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

It is understood that the debates will be prolonged by four or five minutes.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

PARTY FUNDRAISING

The House resumed from March 18 consideration of the motion.

Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to support this motion which states:

> That, in the opinion of the House, the government should bring in legislation limiting solely to individuals the right to donate to a federal political party, and restricting such donations to a maximum of $5,000 a year.

I wish to thank the hon. member for Richelieu for bringing such an important issue to the attention of the House.

This is a two–part motion in which both parts play very important roles because of the significant changes each will bring to the existing system.

The first part, as it eliminates donations to individuals only immediately eliminates any group of individuals from donating. I use the word group here in its broadest sense; that is, groups ranging from large corporations of individuals united under a common banner, be it a corporation, a union or an association, to the duo team of the Mr. and Mrs. group.