

Government Orders

I would ask the hon. member if they are so anxious to cancel this bill because it is such a bad bill, they must obviously have something better in mind. I asked the Minister of Transport today what he had in mind, what he was going to replace this contract with, what he was going to do about the problems at Pearson airport terminals 1 and 2.

The government must have something better in mind. I would like to hear from the hon. member what will replace this bad deal that is better?

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. member's staff has not kept him abreast with what has been going on in government but the Minister of Transport has a national airports policy which has been released that should be of profound interest to this member and the Reform Party.

It takes away from the particular group that I spoke of, a very eclectic group of lobbyists and contractors and the profitability they might make, into a so-called Canadian airport authority, which has representation not just from government but from the community that it serves. It will give that opportunity to all the citizenry, not just around that airport but around that entire region, to have input into the process of decision making for the airport.

Guess what? It is not a revelation. It is quite simply input by the community. What do they need done at this airport? This is what they need done. Who is going to pay for it? They are going to pay for it with good old fashioned, common sense business practices. That is something else the government stands for and which I hear being touted by that party opposite.

On top of that I find it passing strange that we have a Reform Party, a third party in the House who stand opposed to—or in favour possibly of—this motion, when the motion says that we are looking at ensuring there is an opportunity for that eclectic group of contractors and lobbyists to strip away from the Canadian taxpayers a potential of over \$400 million. This comes from a Reform Party, a third party that is concerned with cutting taxes, with ensuring that the debt comes down, with ensuring that the deficit is worked at. They stand and want to support this motion to possibly open the door to give \$400 million to these contractors. It is incredible.

• (1725)

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise again to speak on Bill C-22.

Before I begin my main remarks I would like to correct a statement made earlier in the House today by the minister. I think the words the minister used were that the Liberals were elected to cancel this deal. I do not think that is quite accurate. I think they were elected to review the deal. That is what they

were saying during the campaign, not to cancel the deal but to review it.

An hon. member: I heard the Prime Minister say that. Review the deal and act accordingly.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Not to cancel the deal with no regard for potential costs or the delay at Pearson airport, or due process. Let the record be straight, that was not what the Liberals were elected to office to do.

The decision was made to cancel a project of this magnitude on the basis of a hurried 30-day investigation. The decision was made to cancel a project of this magnitude, in 30 days, without any input from the people involved.

It smacks of a knee-jerk reaction to try to show a government in action, without due regard for the taxpayers of this country. They are the ones who are going to end up paying the bill that we are looking at here.

Unfortunately the solution to this problem has the potential to cost the taxpayers some hard-earned tax dollars that will further increase our deficit. And they are mostly wasted tax dollars because it will do nothing to improve Pearson.

I say mostly because I believe that by going through the courts and opening up this whole mess to the public, we will be doing something to restore some of the trust that has been lost between voters and all politicians. To me anything we can do to remove the cynicism that has developed between the voter and the politician is something at which we should seriously look. That is what we are talking about here.

A major part of the dilemma the government is facing in the debate is the "trust us" to do what is fair and reasonable behind closed doors. The message during the campaign, the message I was getting and I am sure many members were getting was that the trust that had once there had been lost and needed to be regained. We have to re-establish that trust. This bill does not do that.

Members may or may not agree with that, but the fact there were 205 new members elected to the House of Commons says to me very clearly that the voters were not happy with the old politics and wanted some changes in this place. There is no better way to achieve that goal than to open up this process to full disclosure. Let us review the facts that brought us to this point.

First of all, we have a deal that was negotiated by the previous Conservative government behind closed doors. It was signed during the election campaign in the full knowledge that it was going to be reviewed. It was not just a Conservative deal, it is a deal that involved friends on both sides, Liberals and Conservatives.

Second, we had a shady deal and now we have a shady review. Without questioning the abilities of Mr. Nixon who was asked to do the review, if we really believed in restoring the voters' trust and confidence in politicians, whoever was going to do this