

It is a very good deal for the people of the province of Ontario, one I am sure they are grateful for.

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, when I got up this morning and headed to the House I actually had no intention of speaking, although I was feeling pretty good because this is the first day of the last year of this government's tenure. It is the first day. It is the beginning of the last year. The people of Canada should be reminded that this is the last year of its mandate. The people of Canada will be happy to be reminded that if we on this side of the House get constructive alternatives together and start putting them forward in less than a year we will have the opportunity to restore some hope and some pride in this country.

Then in my office I read parts of Bill C-3, an act respecting the acquisition, administration and disposition of real property by the Government of Canada. I know that all of us were in support of this bill, but as I started to reflect on what is really going on in this bill I became concerned. I do agree that anything we can do to make the operations of the Government of Canada more efficient should be supported. I am in total agreement with that aspect of the bill.

There is another aspect of this bill which disturbs me immensely. It concerns me that in one year, with the support of this bill, it is possible that there will be no Crown land assets left. When we think of the history of this Conservative government and its philosophical approach, which has basically been one of retreating from governance and decentralizing the national thrust, we can see the danger that exists in this bill.

I think of my own city of Toronto and the way that this government has disposed of Harbourfront lands, has disposed of Terminal 3 at Pearson International, and of the disposition of the CBC lands. This is a bill that is going to make the developers of every region and every city of Canada ecstatic.

As a result of this bill if a line department has a Crown asset, a land asset, which does not meet that particular department's needs, at that time the department will have the ability to put that land basically out to tender. I understand that the minister was very specific. It could sell this land with three independent bids. That is fine, and that would be the end of it. That is not what

Government Orders

government is all about. We do not run this country by line departments. It may be that the railway lands of this country are no longer of any use to the railways.

As a result of the way this government has dismantled our national railway system the lands do not have the same value any more. That does not mean that those Crown lands could not have a value and a purpose in some other strategic plan or over-all objective to serve the people of Canada.

That is what concerns me. In the process of the government's dismantling and privatizing of our national postal service there may be a post office that may not serve any particular purpose for the post office so it says: "Let us sell it off".

We know that in the past those Crown assets could have been used for other over-all objectives. What concerns me about this bill is that when they decentralize and sell off these Crown lands the over-all national objectives are not being met either. There is not the analysis to determine whether these land objectives can really be served.

That is what bothers me about this aspect of the bill. I repeat: Who could oppose any initiative to make the Government of Canada more efficient? I am in total support of that aspect of the bill. I cannot believe that there will not be moments when line department objectives may not meet the over-all strategic objectives.

We could find that we sold off a piece of land and then 10 years from now we may say: "Why did we do that? We could have used it for parkland. We could have used it for public housing. We could have used it for some other use".

An hon. member: For burying this government.

Mr. Mills: I do not know if we would waste good Crown land on burying this government.

There are dangers with this bill. The dangers are that this bill is in the hands of a government that loves to decentralize, does not believe in national programs and does not believe in an over-all national objective.

I give a warning to the government and the minister who I know is an efficient operator. He should realize that he has to ensure that before the Treasury Board