

minister himself has spent a lot of time on it, and it is well known that the field of transportation and all the various ills implicit in it have been aired in a very complete way. Therefore, I do not propose to speak much longer on this occasion, except to say again that there are probably within this legislation areas of concern that are so long standing that it will take the people affected by them quite a while to realize that here is a vehicle which at last may be able to solve some of these impediments to urban development and to take away some of the roadblocks that have plagued our transportation system.

The only way in which a piece of legislation such as this can be made effective is to get it through the House as quickly as is reasonably possible after we have had a look at it in committee of the whole, and then to make certain that it is being implemented and administered in such a way that its provisions are not used as political footballs by any level of government, but that a genuine joint effort is made by the municipal, provincial and federal authorities involved to do something constructive, because few, if any, problems existing in this nation need attention more than urban development and transportation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. John Harney (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to welcome this bill I should like to assure the minister that we do not do so wholeheartedly because if we were to welcome it without reservation I am sure that he would become somewhat apoplectic. There are some reservations, and some relatively major ones at that. For example, as my colleague, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) pointed out, it is not all that much money that we are proposing to spend in a very vital area over the next few years. As part of the announcement of this bill we were told that an estimate of some \$100 million has been made as the cost of rail relocation in Winnipeg. Those who live in the Ontario area certainly know that a major project of a rail relocation in the Toronto area is intended. I assume that this will consume \$150 million. So, we have \$100 million for Winnipeg and \$150 million for Toronto. What do we have left for Wetaskiwin?

Mr. O'Sullivan: And how much for Hamilton?

Mr. Harney: I do not know whether the railway still goes to Hamilton, but they might want some relocation there, possibly the relocation of the city.

Mr. O'Sullivan: Shame; withdraw that remark.

Mr. Harney: I will, Mr. Speaker. So, really, we should not be led down the garden path wearing rosy coloured glasses. We are not speaking about an awful lot of money here.

We must be a little careful about several other provisions of the bill. We must be careful, not just because it is a complicated bill, but because it is presented to us by a minister who is very eloquent and adept at making a bill look the best possible. As I make my remarks on the bill I will point out the good things that are in it and also the bad things that are in it. Some of the bad things that are in it are simply matters that demand clarification. When it comes to our work in the committee of the whole I will

Relocation of Railway Lines

urge the minister to clarify some of these matters. I know that he fully intends to be as clear as possible because, as the bill says at page 20, it seeks to provide an amendment so as to make certain matters abundantly clear.

Let me read to you the explanatory note:

The purpose of this amendment is to make it abundantly clear that a pedestrian walkway is a highway within the meaning of the Railway Act.

Rarely, in reading explanatory notes to amendments or bills, have I seen this kind of purple prose. Usually, the word "clear" is good enough. But the hand of the minister is evident here. In the same way I hope that he can make other aspects of the bill abundantly clear.

I come to the first matter which needs clarification. In the presentation of the bill, the minister said in effect that the bill will provide that where the railways are required, after the final processes of application and decision are through, to relocate rails, this relocation shall be done at no cost to the railway, that is to say, there will be a no-win no-loss provision for the railway. The relative clause of the bill is on page 5. I refer to clause 5(1)(a). If we read it carefully, we will see exactly what it is that the minister intended to underline here. The clause reads:

5. (1) The accepted plan, together with the financial plan, shall be filed with the Commission and the Commission may accept the transportation plan and the financial plan either as submitted or with such changes in either of them as the Commission considers necessary, if

(a) the financial plan will not, in the opinion of the Commission, either

(i) impose on any railway company affected thereby any costs and losses greater than the benefits and payments receivable by the railway company under the plan.

So, it does appear to be clear that this is a no-win no-loss provision so far as the railways are concerned. What we want to do when we come to the committee of the whole is to hear from the minister whether or not this section also means that if it can be shown by the railway in any way that it can be at all inconvenient or that it can be put to a disadvantage, the plan cannot go through. If that is so, it will be possible in almost all cases for the railways to say "You are, in effect, affecting us adversely", or beneficially, "and therefore you cannot do it."

● (1730)

Another part of this particular section that needs to be clarified is the meaning of the word "railway". What do we understand by "railway"? As an example, in the city of Toronto, CN and CP are seeking to redevelop a major holding of theirs between Front Street and the lake, a project which involves billions of dollars of investment. The railways themselves are not doing the redevelopment, but, rather, subsidiary companies which are owned by the railways. To be specific, the redevelopment will be carried out by a firm called Metro Centre Developments Ltd.

I should like to outline what Metro Centre consists of in terms of its corporate ownership, Mr. Speaker. Metro Centre, we are told, is a joint venture of CP and CN. Accordingly, Metro Centre Developments Ltd. is jointly owned by CP and CN. To all intents and purposes this is the case, although in actuality Metro Centre Developments is owned 50 per cent by Marathon Realty Co. Ltd. and 50 per cent by Canadian National Realities. The latter is presumably owned 100 per cent by CN. Marathon Real-