

Government Orders

Hon. members opposite need only hold their breath for a short time. I recommend they do so and the bill will appear.

• (1320)

When the bill appears they will have ample opportunity to discuss the law relating to lobbyists. They do not need to do it on this bill, but I am delighted they have taken the opportunity. At least we have the advantage of receiving their views on a lobbyists bill. We know when it finally comes before the House the debate will be extremely short because they have all made their speeches on it ad nauseam on this particular amendment.

I am looking forward to a very short debate on the lobbyists bill and getting it studied in detail in committee. I know hon. members of the Bloc Québécois particularly, the Official Opposition in the House, will participate in the committee enthusiastically when that bill comes before us.

In the meantime, why are we delaying this very important piece of legislation? Is it because they want a general discussion on lobbyists? Maybe. If so, they have not said a lot about that. They have been busy denouncing this deal, which we all agree is a bad deal.

I do not think anybody in the House is at variance on that, except possibly that former cabinet minister who sits in the back over there now, the hon. member for Sherbrooke. His views may be shared by the hon. member for Saint John. I would not want to accuse her of supporting a deal like that because of course she was not elected to this House in the last Parliament, although she ran as a candidate for the party that did make the deal.

I think they are the only two in the House who would support it. Of course we have not heard their views that I recall in this debate, so I do not know for sure whether they support this bill. However the opposition does not. The Reform Party does not. The government does not. The New Democratic Party, to the best of my knowledge, does not.

So why all the debate? Hon. members opposite are simply, as I say, trying to jump on a bandwagon to make up for the fact that they failed to criticize this deal, failed to make their criticisms known publicly before the election.

Why was that? Is it because so many of the members of the party opposite were once Conservative and they feel some kinship with the former government that made this deal? Could it be that the hon. member for Richelieu and his colleagues who used to be Tories before they became members of the Bloc feel they ought not criticize the fellow that got them elected in the first place, Mr. Mulroney? It was his government of course and his successor government that made this deal. The deal was clearly made with the friends of the previous government,

although it was the Kim Campbell government that made the arrangement.

Is that why there has been this reticence on the part of the opposition? The Leader of the Opposition of course was a Mulroney puppet at one time. He owes his whole political career to Mr. Mulroney.

It cost \$143 million, was it not, to get him elected? Is that not what they paid to get him elected in his riding in a byelection? If that is what it cost, maybe that was the price of his silence on this issue until the debate came up here in the House of Commons, long after the event, instead of a level criticism dumped on this deal early on, way back during the election campaign. That is the kind of thing that should have happened.

Here the government is seeking to do the right thing and all we get is a long debate with criticisms thrown at the government as though somehow we had made this deal. We unmade the deal; we cancelled it. We have brought the bill in to correct the situation. Hon. members opposite instead of criticizing the government for this should be offering their enthusiastic support for this legislation.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity given me by this debate on Bill C-22 to draw the attention of hon. members on the links between several, apparently unrelated, circumstances.

On May 4, the *Globe and Mail* reported that federal contracts to the private sector, which amounted to \$2.9 billion in 1984-85, reached \$5.2 billion in 1992-93, and will reach an even higher level in 1993-94. The largest item, \$332 million, is related to the maintenance of the air fleet.

Strange coincidence when talking about the sale of Pearson airport to private interests. The second item, \$330 million in 1992-93, is for the management of foreign aid. This expenditure is important when you realize the problems and the complexity of managing CIDA, an agency which, following the Auditor General's report, is trying to prepare a management plan for its activities scattered, as we know, in 115 countries around the world. Federal contracts for the department of defence have gone up from \$740 million in 1984-85, to \$1.5 billion in 1992-93.

• (1325)

The budget for temporary employment has jumped from \$52 million to \$101 million in the same period, this means that it has doubled in nine years. What is more disturbing is that, still according to the *Globe and Mail*, almost half the 36,166 contracts signed in 1992-93 were awarded without call for tenders. I would like to quote Mr. Daryl Bean, president of the