

### PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

In tabling a document on Friday the minister implied that the Ontario government supported his plan to start privatization of Terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson airport.

In fact the report he tabled states that the government's plan could seriously prejudice financing for the future of the airport.

In view of the fact that every responsible group, both in the private and public sectors, questions the minister's timing and his motives on this announcement why is the government in such a hurry?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, when I answered the hon. member's question in the House on Friday, I mentioned and, in fact, showed him a document that had been distributed at a meeting with the Minister of Transport, the Minister of the Environment and four or five mayors from the Toronto area last Monday evening. At the time, the government mentioned something very important, and I quote:

[*English*]

The analysis presented has been prepared by a team of airport consultants using information collected over the course of several years and where necessary professional judgment. However it would not be prudent to make business decisions on the basis of the analysis presented in the document.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Madam Speaker, what is clear to Canadians and what is clear to those stakeholders at Pearson airport is that this minister's drive to privatize is nothing more than politically motivated. It is a pathetic attempt to rescue Tory seats in Toronto.

Will the Minister of Transport do the right thing, right now, and withdraw his request for proposals and have another look at all the alternatives being presented to him by the stakeholders of this country?

**Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, judging from the preamble the hon. member is asking us to hold the RFP back because if we do proceed

### Oral Questions

it might give us some additional seats in the region at the next election.

If that is right it would certainly be because this proposal is going to create 3,200 jobs for people in the Toronto area for five years.

\* \* \*

### CHILD POVERTY

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Madam Speaker, in 1981 there was one food bank in Canada. Today there are close to 300. Two million Canadians, including 700,000 children depend on food banks. My question is for the minister of health.

The new child benefit package gives a small top-up to working poor families, but not to families on social assistance which is creating the "deserving poor" and the "undeserving poor" in Canada. It categorizes and penalizes children for their parents' situation.

Why has the government taken out an advertisement in all Canadian newspapers claiming that this is the fairer way, the simpler way, the more generous way? Are these benefits for children or are they for some Tory right-wing agenda?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Madam Speaker, obviously the terms of reference for us are not those for the NDP. There is no government in the world that can sustain the kind of approach the NDP is going to have in terms of resources. What we do is we use the resources we have and we say to Canadians: "Here is the best way we can provide help to Canadians".

• (1450)

I agree that as long as there are children going to food banks, we have to do the best we can to correct the situation. The reality is, however, that the resources we have in the budget are being used to help the families of low-income workers and I appreciate the member is against that.

Second, I said that soon we will announce a package for children at risk, where a lot of the children she is talking about will be targeted in a way that we can give more help than now. But there is no doubt that it has to be done within the capacity that we have to pay for it. She can be sure that certainly that is what we will do.