

Government Orders

al Assembly. They have questions to ask him about the night those long knives were planted in Mr. René Lévesque's back. They also have questions regarding the kiss to Clyde Wells, when the Meech Lake Accord failed, and when, unfortunately, the Quebec Premier was on his knees, and even crawling, to get a *minimum minimorum* for our province.

The major issue which will have to be debated in a few months with absolute transparency, although I am not sure that we can trust the government to do that, is this: Why should Quebec keep 25 per cent of the voting shares of a country which is literally going bankrupt?

To conclude, I believe that greater transparency is required on the government's part and we will monitor its actions.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: We are getting into bad habits. Members who wish to speak have to stand if they want to be recognized.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I thought we agreed this morning that there would only be 10-minute speeches, with no question or comment period.

The Deputy Speaker: I think the Chair is partly to blame, but you have to remember that, in practice, members of all parties can rise if they want to carry on with the debate. That is why when I rise and see that no one wants to take the floor, I feel kind of compelled to ask the question. I will now recognize the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi.

Mr. Pélouquin: We should follow the right order, Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind. According to the list, I think you should recognize the hon. member for Louis-Hébert.

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert): Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry accused the official opposition of using stalling tactics to delay the passage of Bill C-22.

I want to tell the hon. member that he is absolutely right. By opposing this piece of legislation, we are delaying compensation payments the government cannot wait to pay to its friends, under section 11 of Bill C-22.

The Bloc Québécois put forward an amendment to Bill C-22 respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, which gives me the opportunity to complete the picture I began to draw last week. In fact, I began to compare the situation at airports in various cities with the situation at the Jean-Lesage Airport, in my riding.

I wanted to demonstrate how unfairly the Quebec airport was being treated, by raising a number of issues, including the areas occupied by airports in several provincial capitals. As you will remember, Mr. Speaker, except for the airports in St. John's, Newfoundland, and in Charlottetown, Regina, Yellowknife and Whitehorse, airports in every other capital city occupied larger areas than the airport in Quebec City. I also provided data on the terminal facilities themselves. You will remember that airports in Ottawa, Winnipeg, Halifax and Edmonton have no cause to envy the Jean-Lesage International Airport, quite the contrary since they all have a greater surface area, that is an additional 6,000, 12,000 and 24,000 square metres respectively.

• (1220)

The demonstration I made last week also showed that, between 1988 and 1992, transborder and international flights have increased much more at the Quebec airport, at an average ratio of 10 to 1 compared to other airports.

After that speech, instead of being outraged at such an injustice towards the people of the Quebec City area, a member opposite said my evidence was "bordering on slander". Let me remind this House that the data supporting my demonstration all come from Transport Canada reports. In these days when communication techniques have improved by leaps and bounds, such abysmal ignorance is totally inadmissible, even more so for a member of the House.

Therefore, I wish all members of the government, instead of refusing to admit reality and resorting to insults, would examine quite objectively the motivations supporting Quebecers' desire to leave the Canadian federation; they are simply convinced that it is not beneficial for them and that it cannot be improved.

Last October 25, Quebec elected 54 members from the Bloc Québécois because voters were convinced that the defence of Quebec's interests could not be left to the two big national parties, both of which having centralizing tendencies. It is therefore in keeping with my mandate to defend Quebec's interests that I pursue in the same vein as last week.

We see the same unfairness in the area of research and development applied to transport. According to the Transportation Research and Development Board, Quebec had 45 per cent of the research capability in 1987 and 55 per cent in 1989; however, it only got a few crumbs as far as investment is concerned: 19 per cent from 1983 to 1986; 16 per cent from 1986 to 1991; and 12.3 per cent in 1991.

Therefore, the more research and development capability we had in the transportation sector, the less money we were getting. It is like trying to square the circle. You probably have to be federalist to understand. When confidence is lost, the responsibility for restoring it does not rest with the one who lost it.