

*Government Orders*

• (1045)

The third issue was changing the way committees worked. There would be more consultation, earlier consultation and more power to make changes in the committee structure.

I thought I would review how I think the government is doing on these issues. Polls say that the Prime Minister's popularity is excellent. Politicians have risen in public estimation. They are no longer lower than a rattlesnake's belly in some people's estimation. I hope that is true. I would have to say then that the mark for more integrity in government is quite acceptable on these issues.

Integrity is somewhat fragile, however. There are watchful eyes looking for lapses in integrity: the watchful eyes of the media, the watchful eyes of the public and the watchful eyes of opposition parties. One thing we are ordered to do in opposition is to watch for breaches and lack of integrity.

I thought I might mention some of the stumbles that the government may have made in these issues. NAFTA was promised in the election campaign a very specific review; it was signed pretty much as is. Cruise missile testing, something the Liberals had consistently talked against, has been passed.

On the Ginn takeover, a tiny odour settles around that takeover. The issue of election boundary revision is an issue that has a slight odour to it. I picked up a couple of little items from recent news clips. One is entitled "Pork barrel grows larger". In his ongoing investigation of patronage in federal advertising contracts, Greg Weston reports that the ad industry in Toronto is abuzz with rumours that some cabinet ministers are hoping to influence contracting by crown corporations. Such agencies are supposed to be run as independent businesses on behalf of taxpayers, with no patronage.

I refer to little item in the Ottawa *Sun*. It reports that a junior cabinet minister has been using a chauffeur driven limousine, unauthorized by the Prime Minister. There is a tiny odour in those issues.

I do not want to be overly critical. As I said before the marks on integrity given to the Liberal government at this stage of the game are quite acceptable, but if principles are solid integrity will follow meekly behind. If I could rephrase that, one does not have to work hard at maintaining integrity if one's principles are founded upon a granite base.

Bill C-22 has also a very slight or faint odour about it. It is a faint odour but a definite odour. The cancellation was correct. The desire for fair compensation is correct. However the government needs to bring the bills for fair compensation to the transport committee, have them reviewed in public, and there would be no odour or taint about the cancellation at all. Those

bills need scrutiny. They need open review and there would be no problem with cancelling the Pearson airport deal.

There is no room for ministerial approval. There is no need for backroom deals. On this issue integrity is not difficult at all.

For example, in my young life I did some mountaineering. We went on an expedition to Gondeau Traverse which was technically very difficult. We had fixed pitons in place. We hooked up our carabiners and were able to make this traverse with technical difficulties. We took our less talented friends along to show our prowess. When we got to the middle of Gondeau Traverse we had to rappel straight down an unclimbable cliff.

• (1050)

Without failure, when pulling our rope down from Gondeau Traverse it would hook on a large rock above. A friend of mine, a good chum, had done this traverse numerous times. I must say we were showing off when we did it. We thought we were excellent mountaineers. The last time we did Gondeau Traverse we pulled the rope and the huge rock above us came loose. A 2,000-pound granite chunk fell. The two of us scattered and were very lucky to survive. The rock crashed on the ledge below us and ruined the climbing rope. We both looked upon that as a close miss.

I believe the faint odour that relates to Bill C-22 may just simply be the rope hooking on the rock above the government. There is no need for this to happen. It is completely avoidable.

Why would the Reform Party be so free with this advice to prevent the taint on this issue? I say very plainly that it is because the Reform Party frankly would like the Liberal government to be a success. That may be an issue that some would laugh at. I am particularly keen to see the government bring Canada back to its senses and not stumble on issues where there is no need to stumble. I give this advice freely and openly. There is no need to have the taint on Bill C-22.

An example of how keen we are to see the government succeed as a party is when our leader during comments on "The House" was asked if he were disappointed there was no tax revolt after the finance minister made his budgetary statements. His answer was very revealing. He said to the interviewer: "My desire is not to have a tax revolt. My desire is not to see the budget fail. My desire is to see Canada function at the highest level".

He was saying with those comments that his desire was to see the government succeed. We will stand as reminders to the government if it makes mistakes. In my view it is making a mistake with the bill by not having an open, transparent process as it promised. There is no need for a big review. There is no need for a fancy royal commission. There is a need for transparency.