

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 6, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AGREEMENTS ACT

The House resumed from May 3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-22, an act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to begin by giving a short preamble to our viewers who are watching and wondering why we are working on this amendment. I think it is appropriate to read from *Hansard* the opposition amendment.

The Bloc amendment effectively states that this House should decline to give second reading to Bill C-22, an act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, because the principle of the bill is flawed due to the fact that it contains no provisions aimed at making the work done by lobbyists more transparent.

I will go right to clauses 9 and 10 of Bill C-22. Under the heading "No Compensation", clause 9 states:

No one is entitled to any compensation from Her Majesty in connection with the coming into force of this act.

• (1005)

Clause 10(2)(a) and (b) states:

No amount is payable under an agreement entered into under this section in relation to

- (a) any loss of profit, or
- (b) any fee paid for the purpose of lobbying a public office holder, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the Lobbyists Registration Act.

I do not think it could have been stated any more clearly that any activity related to the lobbying on the Pearson airport contract will not have any remuneration at all.

The Bloc motion also calls for an inquiry which is a delay tactic. It is not going to put this file to rest and will not allow us to deal with the real problems at the airport in Toronto.

First, Canadians clearly know that we in the government, we in the Liberal Party did not support the Pearson development contract. It was cancelled immediately. However because we cancelled that contract, it does not mean we are opposed to redeveloping and reworking the Pearson International Airport.

Going back over the last 10 years, we were dealing with a Conservative government that had this ideological thrust to dismantle everything around here. It offloaded to the provinces; it offloaded to the private sector. The last 10 years was like fire sale city. This was that government's last attempt to have a fire sale of the most profitable organization in the Government of Canada, the Pearson International Airport.

Much of the good work the management of Pearson airport accomplished over the years was tainted by this whole exercise. We want to put this file to rest now so that we can come back at it from square one. Does that mean we are going to go out and do the same deal over again with a different set of lobbyists? No.

In fact there are Bloc members over there who have suggested from time to time that there were Liberal lobbyists involved in this transaction. That is a fact.

It is a well known fact that all the lobby firms in Ottawa do not have just Conservative lobbyists. They have Conservatives, Liberals and NDP. In fact they even have a couple of lobbyists who work on the Reform Party, but I do not know about the Bloc.

An hon. member: No lobbyists for the Reform Party.

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): No lobbyists for the Reform Party. Okay.

The Deputy Speaker: As the hon. parliamentary secretary knows very well, we were supposed to avoid these kinds of across the floor sword waving. If the member would please put his remarks to the Chair, it will avoid getting blood on the rug, so to speak.