

*Government Orders*

● (1715)

In this particular instance, by cancelling the Pearson deal through Bill C-22, the government has clearly chosen to protect the legitimate interests of the collective taxpaying populace as opposed to protecting the individual private interests and profits sought by a handful of lobbyists and contractors.

I do not have any sympathy whatsoever for those lobbyists and contractors because the deal they signed in the dying days of the previous administration was simply not in the best interests of the taxpaying Canadian public as a collective.

In short, I challenge any hon. member in the House to prove that the organization this motion is designed to protect, namely the Pearson Development Corporation, represents the interests of a historically disadvantaged or disempowered group. Prove it.

Are these lobbyists and contractors in a situation of significant disadvantage such that the interests of the majority should be over-ruled in this case? No. All members of the House know full well that the motion before us today was created in the interests of protecting the so-called foregone profits of a very small but extremely privileged minority in our society. It is simply a shameful attempt to impede the legitimate purpose of Bill C-22 which is to cancel a dubious contract made under dubious circumstances by a dubious administration that was not acting in the public interest.

Let us not be fooled by the people in the other place who claim to be fighting for the rights of Canadians. Make no mistake. They are fighting purely for the profits of their corporate colleagues.

In closing, I implore the members of the House to take a purposive approach to the legislation in question in order to properly identify which interests are most appropriate to protect in this case. Should we be looking out for the majority of taxpaying Canadians who stand to gain only what they deserve if the motion before us fails, namely justice? Or should we join our friends in the Tory dominated red chamber by giving their colleagues in the Pearson Development Corporation a chance to take the citizens of Canada to the cleaners on a deal Canadians never wanted the previous government to make in the first place.

The choice is clear. This motion has no merit. Let us dispense with it and get on with serving the legitimate interests of our fellow Canadians.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton West, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport, of which I am vice-chairman, has used his privilege as a member to speak in the House. I made a number of allegations in what I said earlier, and I would appreciate his thoughts on the following: When he told me in committee that subpoenas had not be used to

summon witnesses to appear before a committee since 1917, did he give me the wrong answer? Was he aware of the situation when I showed him proof that this had been done in 1989, 1990 and 1992, for instance, by the hon. member for Windsor, the present government House leader?

Did he purposely answer that this procedure had not been used since 1917 or was he trying to evade the question? Because he knew perfectly well that if we had subpoenaed these people, we would have had genuine answers to our questions.

I have an additional question for the hon. member. If Senator Leo Kolber had been a Conservative, not a Liberal, would he have agreed to be summoned to testify before the Standing Committee on Transport?

[English]

**Mr. Keyes:** Mr. Speaker, I would only answer my hon. friend in an honest and straightforward fashion. Beyond that he asked me to bring forward a process which we discussed thoroughly at committee that he knows full well would have extended the debate on Pearson airport for a minimum of months, maybe years, a process that would have Canadian taxpayers watching, being frustrated with it. It would hold back any development, process and progress at Pearson airport.

● (1720)

Canadian taxpayers want to see Pearson airport succeed. They want it to become viable. They need that airport for economic reasons, to sustain what we see as an important, viable piece of infrastructure for travel across this country, to connect this country and the world.

I would only answer my friend in the most honest, straightforward manner.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Hamilton West. I am glad to see someone from the government side speak that is subject to questioning.

The analogy that the hon. member brings up is very interesting. He said that there were some allegations or possibility of impropriety, so it is in the best interests of Canadians to cancel the deal and not compensate these people. He did not say that it has been properly investigated or if anybody really even created an improper procedure in this whole thing.

It is like being a person associated with somebody who drops dead. We do not know what killed the person, but we charge him with murder because after all he was around somebody that died. We do not even know if a murder happened, never mind whether this person contributed to it. Yet we want to find him guilty. That is what the government is saying in this bill: "We think there are some improper things and if we think there is something improper, then by God there must be something improper, because we know it all". I challenge that.