

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I challenge the government to stand in the House and answer the questions the Canadian people want answered.

If the government has nothing to hide, why is the Prime Minister's former law office refusing to give Mr. Matthews documentation of his meeting with the Prime Minister? The only thing clear in all of this is that Canadian taxpayers are again paying the price for political games of Tory and Liberal insiders.

I ask the Deputy Prime Minister again, for the sake of integrity will she order an independent judicial inquiry? Will the Deputy Prime Minister give this commitment now to the Canadian people? They demand it.

• (1435)

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, logically speaking, if the Prime Minister was supposedly in the pocket of these companies involved, why had he the guts to say no to the deal?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CRIMINAL CODE**

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Justice stated that, if anti-gang legislation would give the police the tools they needed to combat criminal gangs, he would introduce one. Experts from the SPCUM, the Quebec police force and the Quebec unit of the RCMP have been calling for such legislation for a year.

Rather than simply pay lip service, as he did yesterday, how can the Minister of Justice hide behind the current provisions of the Criminal Code and refuse to incorporate anti-gang provisions, as Italy, France and the United States have done?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the important thing is to get the job done; to provide the tools to the police and the prosecutors to detect, prosecute and punish crime.

We have had a request for an amendment to the code with respect to gangs involved in criminal activities. As I told the House yesterday in response to a question on the same subject, I am looking at the question, as is the Solicitor General.

Our departments are examining amendments to the code that might be of help. When we conclude that assessment we will respond. In the meantime, I have invited the hon. member if he has a proposal to put in respect of specific amendments to let me have it. He assured me he will.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the Minister of Justice is rejecting measures that would make the work of the police easier because he is unable to deliver the goods, as was the case in other matters such as genital mutilation, support payments and discrimination based on sexual orientation?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this gamesmanship is both tedious and uncharacteristic. I wish the hon. member would focus on the answer to the question he has put. It is a serious matter.

The police have asked us to consider an amendment to the code which would provide for criminalizing certain organizations. That is not something one does with the snap of a finger or without taking care with the language.

We also have to be concerned about motorcycle groups, for example, that are not criminal, that are quite legitimate. We also have to bear in mind that police already have some 800 sections of the Criminal Code to deal with today.

We will look at the question seriously. We will do the responsible thing. If the hon. member has a specific proposal for language, I have already asked him to provide it to me. I will give it due consideration.

\* \* \*

**PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday brought to light a covered up government document stating cancelling the Pearson development contract would cost the taxpayers of Canada up to \$2 billion.

Another secret document provided to Robert Nixon in October 1993 states: "Crown rate of return considerably better than the crown construction option and the PDC return on investment endorsed as reasonable rate of return by both the finance department and an independent financial consultant".

My question is for the Minister of Finance. If all these documents are wrong, where is the documentation showing this? When will the minister table this documentation in the House?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the document the hon. member refers to as being covered up is one that obviously was covered up as far as he was concerned. He has not bothered to take a look at the documents made public in December of last year dealing with the case before the courts.

One thing the hon. member would want to refer to in looking at the documents and the opinions expressed therein is that the people who determined that Paxport was the appropriate offer to