

Supply

company's pre-feasibility study has shown that this railway service would serve a population of eight million and attract nearly 5,300,000 travellers annually, an increase of 3,700,000 over the current ridership.

We now have information that emphasizes the benefits of HST connections for travellers in terms of security, travelling time and cost. According to the study, travelling time from station to station, calculated with a top operating speed of 300 kilometres per hour, would be 1 hour and 35 minutes between Quebec City and Montreal, 1 hour and 5 minutes between Montreal and Ottawa, and so forth. The time saved, even compared with flying, is considerable.

Furthermore, as is the case in Lyon, the HST could provide a very efficient way to solve the problem of transportation to and from Mirabel and Dorval and could also provide a quick connection between these airports by adding a loop where the train would run only at certain times.

Another reason to support the HST is, of course, the environment. Per passenger, the HST consumes half as much energy as the automobile and one-quarter as much as a jet aircraft.

If the line could be fully electrified, as is the case all over Europe, there would be even less impact on the environment, because there would be no emissions and the train would consume energy that is abundant in Ontario as well as Quebec, a province that is trying to export surplus energy.

I will now discuss job creation, since that is the purpose of this debate. The HST would create a total of nearly 120,000 jobs annually. This initiative would reduce government spending under the Unemployment Insurance Program. I say this in connection with the expected loss of hundreds of jobs as a result of the merger between CN and CP. Ideally, the HST would absorb these workers.

Without a plan for the future, Quebec's railway industry is doomed. The HST would give VIA Rail a second lease on life and a chance to finance railway lines operating at a loss, as the SNCF does in France.

The cost, and I have not had much of time to discuss this aspect, is evaluated at \$7.5 billion, but there would be revenues—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 81(17), the proceedings on the motion have expired.

Accordingly it is my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply now before the House.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Supplementary Estimates (B), 1993-94, laid upon the table Tuesday, March 8, 1994, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion agreed to.)

• (1715)

Mr. Eggleton moved that the Bill C-19, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1994, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time.)

Mr. Eggleton moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mrs. Maheu in the chair.)

(Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.)

(Schedule agreed to.)

(Clause 1 agreed to.)

(Preamble agreed to.)

(Title agreed to.)

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval): On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Roberval on a point of order.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Madam Speaker, since I am not familiar with these proceedings, I was wondering whether the President of the Treasury Board could give this House the assurance that the content of the bill before us is presented in the usual format.

[English]

Mr. Eggleton: Madam Chairman, this bill is in the same form as passed in previous years.

(Bill reported.)

Mr. Eggleton moved that the bill be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.