

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, my humble apologies. It must be Friday morning. I think the House is getting to me this week, but I will be going home to my constituency soon.

● (1010)

The problem in the Toronto area is that we have about 600,000 people out of work. It is serious because Toronto has never before been on its economic knees the way it has been in the last two years.

I am speaking on behalf of all members from Toronto at this moment. We talk among ourselves and we rack our brains on how we can get our city going again. Toronto has always been generous to every region in Canada and is happy to do it.

Do not think for a second that a lot of us were not tempted to move ahead with this project because it created a lot of jobs. We knew however that the contract the Conservatives had was not in the best interests of all of Canada. A lot of the money that was made at the Pearson International Airport, unlike other airports in Canada, was used to subsidize the smaller regions of Canada where the little local airports could not stand on their own two feet.

It is very important when we look at Toronto that we do not compare it to the local airport authority in Vancouver. This is a national airport. The profits and the cash flow from this airport service the country.

There was a lot of temptation for us to say: "Wow, this is about a job creation project for 2,000 people", but in the interests of Canada we said no. The Prime Minister, the caucus and the cabinet said we are not striking this deal.

What do we have to do now? We have to revitalize that airport. It invites tourists here, trade shows, people that want to invest not just in Toronto but in every region of our country and we must revitalize it. We have to get it going, but we have to get it going in the interests not just of a handful of developers, and not just in the interests of a few lobbyists.

By the way, I have a lot of friends who are in the lobby business. Yes, I do. I can tell you there have been many times when we have had tough debates on this, but I have always been consistent. I believe in a strong national government.

We have to put this piece of legislation to bed. We have to finish it off. Then we can put people who look at the macro picture of Canada in place to start revitalizing this airport.

I appeal to all members. If you want a good discussion on lobbyists then stand by and wait for the lobbyists registration act. It is going to be coming before this House in the not too distant future. It will be in committee and we can have a good solid constructive debate.

Do not think for a second that we on this side of the House do not share a lot of your views on the way the lobby industry went up by 10,000 per cent in the last 10 years. Many of us who were MPs in the last government felt that the lobbyists around this town had more influence and more power than even the cabinet. If you think for a second that all of a sudden we are going to look the other way, we are going to have a very transparent constructive piece of lobbyists registration legislation.

Everyone knows I have always been emphatic about the fact that tourism is one of the greatest job creators in this country. Linked to tourism is the fact that our transportation instruments must be healthy and must represent the type of community and country we have. Nowhere is Pearson more important than in the tourism industry. Therefore I am asking members from all regions to put this bill through the next phases quickly so we can get on with the business of revitalizing the Toronto market.

● (1015)

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me real pleasure today to speak to the issue of Bill C-22 on behalf of the Reform Party of Canada. I am pleased because it is always a pleasure to expose the facts about a bad deal, but also because it gives me an opportunity to show how the Reform Party presents a better option for Canadian voters than the old line parties, the Liberals and Conservatives.

I want to describe something for my attentive audience in the Chamber today and those across the nation who are listening in. I want to tell my audience about one aspect of how a political party is organized and the major problems that this sometimes engenders.

The old line parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives, are nearly as old as Canada itself. Even before 1867 they were loose political alliances based on culture and other associations. When we look at the ideology of the two main parties they believe much the same things.

Both parties believe in the great concepts of democracy, the rule of law, the parliamentary system and the general viability of the free enterprise system. Both parties, at least until a few months ago, were national parties. Both have elected English and French Canadian Prime Ministers. In fact there are so many likenesses that a person not acquainted with this country might ask what makes them different.

There is one telling difference. I would describe a political party as a circle of friends committed to a common political purpose. People who are not friends will not be able to work together to achieve this purpose and a group of friends not committed to the political purpose will of course accomplish almost nothing. Both elements must exist in order for an effective political party to exist; a group of friends and a common political purpose.