

● (1632)

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

**Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the consent of the House to go back to a motion I proposed a few minutes ago. I believe I owe the parliamentary secretary an apology, because of all the people in the House he is the only one I forgot to consult.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I do not want to prevent the hon. member from bringing back the motion that he tried to get unanimous consent on before, but I want to make sure that there is complete consultation and that no member has gone out of the House who would not approve it. I will ask whether there is unanimous consent for the hon. member to revert to his motion. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member has asked permission to suspend the debate temporarily and revert to the consideration of private members' bills.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That Bills C-206, C-207, C-241, C-318, C-325, C-348, C-399, C-400 and C-402 be discharged, and the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. McCleave:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, I am advised that these bills do deal with the matter of pornography and I am quite in favour of having them referred to that committee.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, we still agree with the motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, as hon. members can see, the negotiations have been speeded up and instead of waiting until Tuesday to discuss this important subject, we shall begin this evening.

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members have heard the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The House will revert to consideration of notice of motion no. 13.

*Railway Rights-of-Way*

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

## RAILWAY ACT

## SUGGESTED REVERSION TO CROWN OF RAILWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker):

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending section 88 of the Railway Act to provide for the reversion to the Crown of railway rights-of-way, originally obtained as government subsidies, upon their ceasing to be used for railway purposes pursuant to sections 106, 119 or 254 of that Act.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, this must be Friday fever. First we have a motion that everyone agrees to, except the parliamentary secretary to the House leader who does not know anything about it and therefore feels obliged to object. If he had talked to his boss or anybody else he might have been better informed, but I guess that has to be done publicly.

In this very special debate we have been treated to the socialistic idea that if a private company does not live up to its obligations we take our largesse away from it. This must be Barrett fever in British Columbia. I can tell those two hon. members, whom I consider to be very right-wing members, that I have attended NDP conventions where you could not be assured that this kind of motion would pass without considerable discussion. It was enlightening to listen to the conversion that has taken place, and I hope it lasts for more than a Friday afternoon.

We are certainly very happy to agree to this motion and are of the opinion that it is worth while. We were not only surprised that the two members who have just spoken suggested that abandoned lines should revert to the Crown but that the last speaker went on to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway has abused its position. It was given a great deal of land across the country, and although that land may not have been too valuable at the time, it is now of immense value. That should be given some consideration in terms of its current performance in operating a railway. For both members to indicate that view gives me a great deal of confidence that something will be done about the railways.

I agree entirely with the member who said that when we gave the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific the right to huge tracts of land to be used for a transportation facility across this country to carry passengers and freight, we anticipated that is just what they would do. The mover of this motion indicated they have done it to a degree, but I believe they have done more than that. They have used that money to buy mines and airplanes, they have built airlines and hotels and all those things you see on television. They have husbanded the assets we provided very well, but they have done less well in serving the Canadian public.

As the previous speaker said, they have abused their privileges. Maybe we should not now have linen on the tables and flowers on the tables and silver in the railway dining cars. That