

other objection to the intended expropriation which has been served on him, whether the interest proposed to be expropriated is reasonably required for the achievement of the objectives of the Crown.

As I understand it, what we are seeking by this amendment is an arrangement under which the Crown would be called on to appear at such a hearing and, in effect, show cause for a proposed expropriation. The feeling of those who support the amendment is that though the clause as it stands provides for a public hearing, it does not place the two parties on an equal plane. A public hearing is held, all right, provided a notice has been filed with the minister in accordance with clause 7, but at this public hearing it is not really necessary under the wording as it now stands for the Crown to appear. In other words, the person whose land is being expropriated is able to make his case and give reasons why the expropriation order should not go through, but the Crown for its part is not required to appear and make it clear that a particular parcel of land is really required in the public interest, or in order that the government might achieve the objective it has set out. My hon. friend feels, and I agree with him, that if we are changing the law with regard to expropriation, the Crown should be required to appear at a public hearing of this sort.

It seems to me that what is proposed is eminently fair. If this amendment is not adopted, the person whose land is to be expropriated is not on the same footing as the authority which is trying to expropriate his land. The motion I am putting forward in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood would correct this situation.

I might point out that amendment No. 3, which Your Honour has already read, together with amendments Nos. 4, 5 and 6, is consequential. Once we have decided on amendment No. 2, the others fall into place. If we pass amendment No. 2, it is obvious we shall want to pass the other amendments because they are consequential. If the House does not see fit to accept the amendment before us, I see little point in even moving the other amendments. The proposal we are now considering would put the Crown in the position of having to give reasons before a public hearing in support of proceeding with an expropriation and I feel it ought to receive the support of the House. As I say, I understand there were members in all parties who supported this proposition in the committee. I do not know what the vote was, but I am told there was support from all sides. I hope that

### *Expropriation*

since then, consideration having been given to this matter by the government, a favourable decision has been reached.

We are all impressed by the fact that new law is being written in this field. We give credit to the government for the initiative it has shown. We suggest, however, that the government go all the way and that in these public hearings the Crown should be on the same footing as the person whose property is being expropriated. This is the purpose of the amendment presented by my hon. friend from Greenwood, as I understand it, and I wage that it be adopted.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa Carleton):** First of all, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He is not a member of the committee; he is filling in for his hon. friend from Greenwood who is a member, at very short notice, I am sure. He has admirably explained the purpose of the amendment to the House.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That is the advantage of not having been a lawyer.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** He says that is the advantage of not being a lawyer. But I believe he has been in the House for so many years that some of the legal talent available in the chamber has rubbed off on him.

The purpose of the amendment and, indeed, of amendments Nos. 2 to 6, because, as the hon. member noted, they stand together, is that the Minister of Public Works should be represented at the hearings in support of proposed expropriations, and that the hearing officer should form an opinion on the merits.

With respect to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I suggest he is confused as to the purpose of the public hearing. The concept of a hearing in connection with expropriation legislation is new. The purpose is to allow those who have an interest in the expropriated property to make their objections heard in public. In addition to owners, planning boards, municipalities or regional governments might wish to object. The hearing officer would listen to those objections and make a report to the Minister of Public Works. The hearing is not a judicial inquiry; it is not an adversary procedure pitting the minister against the expropriated owners or others interested. The purpose of the hearing is to bring to the public's attention the objections and the reasons for those objections. The purpose is not to force the Minister of Public Works, on behalf of the people of