

million annually over a five-year period, to modernize and improve the infrastructures and facilities at Dorval and Mirabel.

The previous and current governments chose Toronto, and Montreal is still paying the price. According to the daily *Le Soleil*, in 1990, 20.5 million passengers were processed at Pearson Airport, compared to 8.9 million for Dorval and Mirabel combined. In the same editorial, Michel Audet points out that, in 1952, Montreal had 20 per cent more head offices and financial institutions than Toronto. But by 1988, it had 60 per cent fewer. Mr. Audet also mentions the fact that between 1975, which is the year Mirabel opened, and 1980, the number of passengers increased by only 13 per cent in Montreal, compared to 37 per cent in Toronto. This pattern has persisted and is even more pronounced now. This bias also led to significant job loss in the greater Montreal area. For example, an official of the Public Service Alliance mentioned that he now represents only 900 employees in the Montreal area where he used to speak for 1,200 workers in 1978.

• (1355)

I leave you with the conclusion Claude Picher came to while reviewing the study conducted by Aéroports de Montréal, a study which concluded that the greater Montreal should keep both its airports. Mr. Picher said, and I quote: "Hundreds of millions of dollars have been thrown in this venture which did nothing to improve the competitiveness of Montreal. Quite the opposite in fact, since the Mirabel fiasco is partly responsible for redirecting traffic to Toronto."

Since airports in Dorval, Mirabel, Edmonton and Vancouver were handed to non-profit corporations, why should we have something different for Toronto? Is it that what is good for the rest of the country is not good enough for Toronto? The government does not seem to want to answer to the requests made by the greater Toronto area, why is that so? Why does the government not entrust the management of Terminals 1 and 2 to a non-profit organisation immediately?

The Deputy Speaker: I am very sorry, but I have to inform the hon. member that her time is up.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, for more than two weeks, we in the Bloc Québécois have been constantly raising what is now usually called the Pearson affair. We do not have to reinvent the wheel, we only have to use it properly.

In other words, even if what I am about to say is not all new, it is important to repeat it until concrete action is taken on this problem. The aspect I wanted to underline concerns the popular financing of federal political parties. This debate is related to a motion presented in the House by my friend and colleague, the

member for Richelieu. The reason for popular financing is so simple that even a child would understand it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if you are a student and your parents pay your rent, your dearest wish is to find a job so you can meet your own needs and do as you please. It is easy to understand, you are indebted to your provider. In politics, it is exactly the same. The ultimate goal of any political party should be to be as independent as possible. The only way to reach this goal is to be financed by public contributions. We are elected by the people and are answerable to them. If our hands are tied by multinationals which finance us, our room to move will be very limited, particularly if the interests on the one side do not necessarily go together with those on the other. If financial reasons did not guide the actions of governments, people would pay more attention—

The Speaker: Order. As my hon. friend knows, you have a few minutes left for your speech. You will have the floor again after Question Period.

It being two o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to Statements by Members, pursuant to Standing Order 31.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

BOSNIA

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Mother's Day. Sons and daughters everywhere reaffirmed their love for their moms, whose love for their children knows no bounds—not distance, not time, not even death.

The bond that exists between mother and child is stronger than the strongest steel, harder than the hardest wood, and more enduring than any other bond of love.

Today I speak of those children who, because of war, have lost their mothers or whose mothers or families can no longer provide for them. I refer to the children of Bosnia.

I urge each of us in the House to do everything we can and ask the government to act quickly to provide a safe haven for these orphans of war.

Let Parliament lead in easing their pain, their hunger, their illness, their injury and their imminent death, even as we intensify our efforts to search for peace in that part of the world. Let Canada be a mother to the children of Bosnia orphaned by war.