

*Adjournment Debate*

This government strongly believes in directing resources to programs which help those most in need. One important example is a refundable child tax credit program which is designed to help low and middle income families. The maximum level of the child credit has gone up by more than 50 per cent since 1984, from \$367 to \$565 in 1989. Close to 5 million children benefitted from this measure in 1989. Also, families with preschool-aged children benefit from a supplement of \$200 per child. In total, the child tax credit is worth about \$2 billion annually out of the government coffers.

The government has also introduced major tax reforms. About 850,000 lower income Canadians were removed from the tax rolls. In 1986, a refundable sales tax credit was introduced to support low-income families. Effective in 1991, this credit is to be superseded by a new enhanced goods and services tax credit targeted to low-income and middle-income families.

• (1820)

I would like to remind the House of the recent adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. This convention is intended to protect and promote the physical, spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of children. Clearly, actions pertaining to the conditions and rights of Canadian children will have to be taken in co-operation with the provinces.

In addition, recently the Minister of National Health and Welfare announced that the federal government would be pledging \$1.3 million toward the establishment of a 24-hour national hotline to assist children in trouble.

Certainly the government has taken heed of low-income families, of families in need. The most serious is young children who are in need in low-income situations. The government concentrated on all those things and as our economy becomes more buoyant we can more to help alleviate the problems that the hon. member for Parkdale—High Park has mentioned.

TRANSPORT

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, on February 14 of this year I rose in the House to ask a series of questions of the Minister of Transport, who has now gone on to other duties.

The questions related to the announcement the day before by Bombardier of Montreal that it was prepared to invest in a high speed rail passenger system in this country. Bombardier indicated that the only way it was possible to develop such a system from the financial side was if the federal government participated to the tune of \$1.7 billion.

The proposal by Bombardier is being paralleled by a study being done by the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. They just held hearings in this city this week and will be holding hearings throughout the area along the corridor.

A number of people have expressed interest, including obviously provincial jurisdictions, and the Bombardier Company. Lavelin, through its subsidiary UTDC, is indicating its interest and willingness to work in co-operation with Bombardier for the maintenance of facilities at their plant in Kingston, which is along the corridor.

The Standing Committee on Transport has long held interest in the concept of high speed rail. The New Democratic Party has proposed that high speed rail is the way to go, particularly in the corridor.

We just heard in the transport committee from the new Minister of Transport about the update on the study of south central Ontario *vis-à-vis* air services. We know there is massive construction at Pearson International Airport right now for Terminal III. We have an environmental assessment review process under way to give consideration to the addition of one or two more runways at Pearson International to handle the ever increasing air traffic. We heard from the Deputy Minister that Pickering is not dead, but is still on the table as a possibility for a second major airport in Toronto.

The whole concept of high speed rail connecting Windsor to Quebec City, but more important, Toronto—Ottawa—Montreal, even at a high cost of \$3.5 billion or \$3.4 billion is quite competitive, both in financial terms whether it be private sector dollars or public dollars and in terms of the time factor. High speed rail can compete head to head with air, downtown to downtown, getting people from Toronto to Ottawa by rail faster than by air. People can arrive at the city, not harassed because they had to drive to the airport through the congestion of Toronto, go through security, wait on the tarmac, fly through rough weather to Ottawa, and go through the