

*Transportation*

abandonment. I have often spoken in the house on this subject. As I pointed out on several occasions, I had a sad experience in representing an area which had a rail line abandonment of the greatest magnitude of any place in western Canada, some 122 miles. When this application was before the Board of Transport Commissioners, I did a lot of research into the problem and know something about the sociological and economic disruptions created by rail line abandonment.

I do not want to pursue the subject any further than to say I am a little concerned about the principle that has been adopted temporarily by the government under the guidance of the Minister of Transport. I refer to the freeze on rail line abandonments until 1975. It seems to me that 1975 is now too far away. I am afraid we are going to be opening another kettle of fish at that time. I believe there should have been more effort to bring the rationalization principle into effect, so there would be no necessity for opening this subject again. In the meantime we are going to be faced with a series of applications for the abandonment of short lines which will come before the new commission which is set up.

I am disappointed that the minister did not see fit to include in this legislation a principle which I have advocated on numerous occasions. I refer to the fact that if a line is to be abandoned after proper study, there should be a freeze on the abandonment order for five years. This would give businesses, farmers and municipalities adjacent to that line a chance to liquidate their businesses, provide roads to replace the railroads, give the farmers a chance to remove their permit books to other areas and so make the necessary readjustments when the line has been taken out. However, we may still have a chance to see that principle incorporated at a later date.

• (9:50 p.m.)

We have done our best to produce a good bill. I am not trying to discredit anybody in saying this because I think we have done our best. However, I still feel that the bill falls far short of what is necessary to provide a good transportation policy. For example we should have incorporated in the bill a clause to the effect that the government in five or six years time should review the legislation and iron out any anomalies or bugs which might have become apparent by then. Had this been done, Mr. Chairman, even though criticism has been directed toward the bill we would have left ourselves in the position where the

[Mr. Southam.]

people of Canada would be able to say that the government had co-operated with the opposition to come up with the best possible bill, and I think the people would be well satisfied. We have a right to be a little critical of the bill, and in concluding my remarks I express the hope that the legislation works out better than I think it will at the present time.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again later this day.

**The Chairman:** Is that agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Progress reported.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to standing order 6(2) I move:

That the house continue to sit after ten o'clock p.m. this day.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

(Translation)

**Mr. Grégoire:** Until what time are we going to sit?

[English]

**Mr. Starr:** Mr. Speaker, this motion is not debatable.

**Mr. Grégoire:** May I ask the house leader, until what time?

**Mr. McIlraith:** Until we complete this bill, except for third reading.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It appears to the Chair that there is some objection taken. Therefore, may I read the first part of standing order 6(2):

A motion that the house continue to sit after the hour specified in section (1) may be made at any time without notice. If any member objects to the motion, Mr. Speaker shall request those members who object to rise in their places, and if ten or more members then rise, the question shall not be put on the motion.

Are there objections to the motion?

*And fewer than ten members having risen:*