

these recommendations? I draw to his attention the first part of our recommendations dealing with terminal No. 3.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will recognize the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud). He has five minutes to reply.

[Translation]

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, thank you for letting me know how much time I have left to answer the Hon. Member who took advantage of the period set aside for questions to make his own speech.

When I started my speech, I said I was glad the Government had accepted ten of our recommendations for action. I am of course pleased the Government acted on recommendations for terminal 3 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, and I hope the Government will do the same in all future planning for airports in this country.

In fact, we went to visit various airports and we noticed various construction details for separating the passengers and improving ground security, and our recommendation was to ensure that the people who plan our airports are aware of the facilities they have in Europe and apply the same standards here in Canada.

So I am delighted with the Government's decision, and I hope it will keep up the good work. However, even with the best facilities in the world, we still need a security system that offers better protection to Canadians and to passengers than the one we have at the present time.

I think the Government should take action on security as soon as possible.

[English]

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I was not prepared to speak to this motion this afternoon. However, I will take this opportunity to speak, having just recently received a letter dated March 22 from the Mayor of Vancouver which raises a number of issues and concerns about railway safety and the Railway Safety Act in particular.

I would also like to take this opportunity to reiterate a number of my concerns about the Port of Vancouver and other transportation problems in the Vancouver region.

The major concern expressed in this letter from the Mayor of Vancouver is with regard to Bill C-105, the Railway Safety Act. The city is very concerned that this Bill does not provide for municipalities to be allowed any kind of involvement in regulations that are put into effect under Section 24. Apparently this means that municipalities will not have opportunities to effectively develop land in the vicinity of railway lines.

Many cities in western Canada evolved around the railways, and urban renewal and development of the massive amount of land around those railways, which was given to CPR in the early days, is vitally important to the development of our cities and the transportation within them.

Motions

The city manager for Vancouver was somewhat more specific. He wrote to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities about this concern and said that the City of Vancouver is very concerned about the proposals in Bill C-105 to eliminate the provision of railway relocation orders which assist urban redevelopment. He said that the city strongly supports the position of FCM on this matter.

Throughout the city's history, the relocation of railways has been a vital tool for redevelopment of the city. For example, the very dense housing developments now on the south shore of False Creek could not have happened without such relocation. We anticipate an equal need for this tool in the future. For example, the city will be negotiating with the Burlington Northern Railway, which is an American railway, for the joint use of the Grandview cut by both the railway and a major roadway which will link the Trans-Canada Highway with the centre core of Vancouver.

• (1340)

I am particularly concerned about this, because it goes right through my riding. Those negotiations on the part of the city are apt to be very difficult. The very existence of the powers now in the Railway Relocation and Crossing Act help the bargaining process. They want some of the present provisions in the Act to be maintained, as I understand it. I would ask the transport committee to look into this matter, because it does seem to be a very important and serious complaint. I am sure there would be similar concerns in other cities. I do not mention it only from the point of view of the City of Vancouver.

Another interesting issue in this letter concerning the Mayor of Vancouver is that under Bill C-105, Part V, Clause 44, the Minister may establish a railway safety consultative committee having between 9 and 11 members representing various interests. But a member to represent municipalities is not specified. As municipalities will obviously be much affected by the recommendations made by the committee, we recommend that a member be established to represent municipalities. That is tremendously important. It seems to me it is an omission that the federal Government also makes in other structures.

I recall when there was a complete reorganization of the port authority that the structures allowed for government appointees, which we know will be political appointees to an advisory committee or board in the case of the corporation, but did not allow for any input from the communities that surround the port. Many of them are affected by port developments, and can be extremely helpful in co-ordinating planning.

I wish to give one example of why it is important to have municipalities represented on railway consultative committees, particularly regarding safety. In Vancouver, two years prior to Expo the powers that be, certainly over the objections of residents in my community, decided to move the transfer point for dangerous goods from the central core of downtown Vancouver a few blocks east outside the Expo area into east