

spin-off analyses are conducted. The absence of any serious analysis in the case of a transaction of such a scope simply makes no sense.

• (1655)

We could also have talked about the lack of a serious and independent analysis on projected revenue. We could have talked about the lack of analysis of the investors' situation. Those investors' were not very solvent, but with the overall benefits that the federal government was giving them, they were sure to be able to spend the rest of their lives in lavishness.

This attempt to privatize the Pearson airport is highly outrageous. No wonder that Canadian government finances are in such a mess. Why is it that the federal accrued debt will be around \$550 billion this year? Why is it that we have so much trouble reducing the deficit below \$40 billion annually? Why is it that we cannot control our government finances any more and that we are expecting another warning from the International Monetary Fund in the near future?

If there have been other transactions as dubious, as obscure, as appalling as this one, because it serves the friends of the Liberal Party, of the Conservative Party, in fact, the old Canadian parties, I understand why things are going badly in Canada. I understand why government coffers are being drained at an alarming rate and why the Minister of Finance is forced to take unpopular actions that affect the most powerless among Quebecers and Canadians, in order to serve the friends of the party, in the light of the millions of dollars that were in there, that were concealed there. Since there is no political will to get right to the bottom of that deal in order to avoid others in the future, I understand why Liberals tend to be more drastic than Tories used to be.

Ever since the Minister of Transport introduced Bill C-22, the Bloc Quebecois has been criticizing the fact that no public inquiry, no serious analysis has been made by a royal commission of inquiry.

Every time I look at all the benefits that deal had to offer, I keep asking myself: "Will it be better with the bill?" I think perhaps it could not be better, from a certain standpoint, because the Minister of Transport will still be able to bribe some friends of the Liberal Party of Canada, he will still be able to use his discretion to give his friends tens of millions of dollars, if he so desires, to make up for a potential loss without an analysis being made or a royal commission being established to get right to the bottom of the deal.

I am looking at that in comparison with the decisions the Minister of Finance made when he tabled his last budget on February 22 and reduced the unemployment benefits and the credits for senior citizens. Over the last few days, the Minister of Finance seems to be suggesting that the registered retirement

savings plans could also be taxed, but family trusts are still being maintained.

Officials were told not to give any information to members of Parliament about the hundreds of millions that could be concealed there. This is precisely serving the interests of those same friends of the Liberal Party of Canada, or maybe the very rich friends of the Conservatives. It is also serving the 2,000 Canadian millionaires who did not pay a dime in income tax last year.

When I compare that to other decisions of the government, such as the possibility that the Minister of Transport compensate once more friends of the ruling party, I say it is a disgrace. The Liberals should be ashamed of themselves, the Minister of Finance first of all, as well as the Minister of Transport, his accomplice.

As for the Senate amendment, like my friend said, in my view the Senate has no value. It is not a legitimate and democratic authority. Therefore we dismiss everything that comes out of the Senate, good or bad.

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Before moving on to the question and comment period that should follow the speech of the hon. member, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Bourassa—Immigration; the hon. member for Mercier—Social program reform; the hon. member for Quebec—National Defence; the hon. member for Red Deer—Haiti.

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, my colleague just spoke on Bill C-22, the bill to cancel the privatization project of Pearson airport. I would like him to tell us about the millions of dollars that are being spent. It was said earlier that perhaps the Liberal government should give these companies thirty million dollars in compensation rather than wait for court action where they might get more. Could the hon. member tell me whether or not such monies are actually available, that is, if Pearson Airport brings in that much money, how come we have so little money to keep regional airports open, why is it that the Minister of Transport wants to close our regional airports?

These airports mean a lot to us. In remote areas like northern Quebec, where air travel is the only means of transportation, what are people going to do when they want to travel south? How do we measure the cost? If the Val d'Or airport, for example, is to be closed on the medium term for lack of money, why not divert some of the money from profitable airports, like Pearson and maybe Montreal, to bring some equity nationally and thereby permit us to travel by air?

Maybe my colleague has an opinion on this and on the way to make the system equitable.