

*Expropriation***LABOUR RELATIONS****LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE—DENIAL OF  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE TO  
CASUAL WORKERS**

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** This question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, but perhaps it may be taken as notice by his parliamentary secretary if he is not in a position to answer at the moment. Has the minister reconsidered the decision to deny unemployment insurance benefits to those casuals employed on the British Columbia waterfront in longshoring who had no part in the decision to strike and who have been, at least up until now, considered ineligible for B.C. welfare benefits on the grounds that they have unemployment insurance stamps in their books?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I shall draw the attention of the minister on that question so he may give his answer the next time he is in the House.

[*English*]

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****EXPROPRIATION****ACQUISITION AND ABANDONMENT OF LAND,  
APPOINTMENT OF HEARING OFFICERS, ETC.**

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice)** moved that Bill C-136, respecting the expropriation of land, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill was first introduced in the House during the last session of parliament as Bill C-200 on May 23. It is designed to reform the law relating to the compulsory acquisition or expropriation of land by the federal government and by its agencies. We trust that this comprehensive revision will largely remove the arbitrary features long associated with the existing federal expropriation law. We trust also that it will provide a consistent legislative scheme predicated on an advance notice of intent to expropriate, on a public hearing before expropriation, a prompt offer of payment, revised negotiation procedures, and statutory principles of compensation.

The existing law on the subject is found mainly in the Expropriation Act as it now exists, chapter 106, Revised Statutes of

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Canada, 1952. It has remained substantially unmodified since its enactment in 1886. Even then, it was not very new since the provisions of the existing law can be traced to earlier public works legislation and to inter-colonial railway legislation.

I suggest to the House, therefore, that there is very little wonder that a law which was drafted and prepared for a primarily agrarian rural society is in its present form, at a time when 80 per cent of Canadians live in the great urban centres of the country, wholly unsuited to the complexities and realities of modern urban life.

When the bill was first introduced in the spring, I made reference to the fact that several provincial governments had reviewed their legislation on expropriation recently. The federal government, in preparing the bill now before the House, owes a good deal to the research made by Chief Justice McRuer and his report, and to the hon. Mr. Clyne of British Columbia and his report. I want to say that the federal government never hesitates to borrow and to adopt the good ideas advanced by the provincial legislatures, and in this instance I think much credit can be attributed to those earlier studies. We feel that in several ways perhaps this bill may be a further improvement.

The legislation, if adopted by the House and by the other place, will apply to all federal departments and to expropriations by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the National Capital Commission, the National Harbours Board and the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority. It will not, however, extend to inter-provincial railways or to private companies under special acts which exercise special expropriation powers. We plan to deal separately with these companies in the future. Obviously, if we had applied this bill to the Canadian National Railways without having corresponding legislation affecting the Canadian Pacific Railway it would not have been a just piece of legislation. We are actively reviewing that particular problem.

Since the bill was introduced, I have had consultations with the Bar across the country and in response to a circular letter which I sent out to members of the Canadian Bar Association I received about 1,700 requests for copies of the bill. In response, the department received hundreds of letters, some detailed, some less detailed, from lawyers across the country who had some expertise in this very complicated area of legislation. Indeed, at the Canadian Bar convention here in Ottawa in