

light of the request by the City of Winnipeg for the relocation of the CP railway yards to an unpopulated area—and not only in Winnipeg but in many other cities as well—may I ask the Minister how many times this sort of accident will have to happen—is he waiting for people to be killed? How many times does it have to happen before the Government will act on feasibility studies and on the actual relocation of railway marshalling yards to unpopulated areas?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, in 1979 or 1980 an agreement had been reached that an overpass would be built, and the city and the Province requested UTAP money for that purpose. An amount of \$7.6 million was allocated. But later, because of local opposition, the municipality decided to drop that project—regretfully, in my view.

The relocation had always been considered to be rather expensive at \$170 million, which would probably be up to \$300 million at this time. There are all kinds of problems associated with it besides the financial ones. For example, where the yard would go is one problem. All this is to say that at one point the city had a choice to make. It decided not to go ahead with the Sherbrooke-McGregor overpass. Since then it has decided to get involved in a core development program, and this is very well known to Members of the House.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Madam Speaker, had that explosion occurred last night at the overpass at one end or at the underpass at the other end, people would have been killed. That is not the answer. Those yards have to be relocated.

#### REGULATIONS GOVERNING TRANSPORTATION OF DANGEROUS GOODS

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West):** It is two years and four months since the legislation on the transportation of dangerous goods was passed. The Minister has recently presented one-third of the regulations but they are still not in force, and two-thirds of the regulations have yet to see the light of day.

When is the Minister going to publish regulations that do something about the security of railway cars that contain, or used to contain, dangerous goods, in storage and marshalling in railway yards? What action is he taking to try to prevent what occurred last night from happening again?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, I think my hon. friend should make a distinction between railways operations under the Railway Act—and there are plenty of regulations for the operation of railways in yards or outside them—and the transportation of dangerous goods. That is really a different issue. On the transportation of dangerous goods, as he said, we have gazetted the first units of regulations now. Most people who are well informed on the subject, while regretting that we have not gone faster in drafting these regulations, understand why it has been done so slowly according to the Hon. Member's standards. Drafting the regulations is terribly difficult because of the many jurisdictions that have to be reconciled, and I have explained that before. The operations in the yard come under the Railway

Act and are not really a matter that would come under the transportation of dangerous goods, as far as I am concerned.

**Madam Speaker:** Could I ask all Hon. Members to please try to be more brief. We are running considerably behind time. I want to warn Hon. Members on both sides that they will not be able to get their usual number of questions in today. I would ask them to be very brief for the rest of the Question Period.

\* \* \*

● (1450)

#### TRANSPORT

##### PROTECTION OF BRIDGES—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL ACTION

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. It arises out of the Canadian Coast Guard report on the vulnerability of standing bridge structures in Canadian waterways. The Minister will be aware that there are at least five from Vancouver to Halifax in some degree of danger. Ideally these bridges should be protected. The Minister will have in front of him a proposal from the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia on an 80-20 per cent cost sharing arrangement to alleviate the possibility of imminent disaster. Will the minister give some indication of his preparedness to call together the various jurisdictions for the purpose of sitting down and resolving this very potentially disastrous problem?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, I have answered this question a number of times. I have stated quite clearly that the responsibility for intraprovincial bridges is a provincial one. My hon. friend knows that, and I am quite sure that he agrees with it. Consequently, the protection of intraprovincial bridges under Canadian law is a provincial matter. However, because I am sympathetic by nature, and sympathetic to this particular subject, I have gone further and have said that I will be looking with the Provinces—Nova Scotia, in this particular instance—to find if there could not be savings on other transportation matters which could be made in order to help the federal Government make a contribution to this particular objective.

##### REQUEST THAT MINISTER INITIATE NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Madam Speaker, an additional 800 transits will occur beneath the Angus L. Macdonald and A. Murray MacKay bridges into Bedford Basin this year. Will the Minister undertake to the House that he will ask his officials to initiate negotiations immediately which will lead to the conclusion that I am sure he shares, as well as all of us on this side of the Chamber?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, there is a federal-provincial body to look into these matters. I remember that this was one of the items that I