

**Mr. Harney:** I see the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) nodding. That is contagious. I see the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) shaking his head. Perhaps he is chatting. But the point has been made. I think we should consider amendments seriously.

We should also consider the size of grants to be offered by the federal treasury to meet the net cost of the relocation. I can imagine cities and towns like Toronto, Winnipeg, and possibly Wetaskiwin, mentioned earlier, undertaking to put up 50 per cent of the cost of a relocation project in co-operation with the provincial government. That course is possible for Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg, Vancouver, and so on. The definition section of the bill—and the bill provides funds for the redevelopment or amelioration of certain urban areas—defines “urban area” as “an area or areas . . . classified by Statistics Canada in its most recent census . . .” According to the Dictionary of the 1971 Census Terms compiled by Statistics Canada, an urban area includes “(1) incorporated cities, towns and villages with a population of 1,000 or over,” which includes most incorporated communities of Canada, and “(2) unincorporated places of 1,000 or over, having a population density of at least 1,000 per square mile”, and so on. That definition covers practically every organized community in Canada. I wonder what the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) would say if he were here.

**Mr. Woolliams:** He is not here.

**Mr. Harney:** He had to go away, slightly ill. It is the weather which had that effect on him. If the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville were here I am sure he would say something like this: “Look at the situation in Yorkton, where both the CNR and the CPR have a crossing in town.” Actually, the lines meet right in the middle of town, right along Broadway Street. He would say: “Surely we want some kind of redevelopment to make the centre of our town more attractive, but how can Yorkton do this, even in co-operation of the government of Saskatchewan, if it has to pay a significant part of the 50 per cent of the cost of the relocation which is not picked up by the federal government?” I wonder if this bill offers much of a gift to the smaller communities of Canada.

That brings me back to my first point. As only \$250 million is being offered under the bill for the next five years, once Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and other large centres have taken their share, there will be not much left for other communities.

I said at the beginning of my speech that I welcome parts of the bill. I welcome without qualification Clause 6, particular subclause (2), which provides that the railways must comply with the request of the CTC when it asks them to make their rights of way available for purposes of public or rapid transit in our urban communities. Several members of the House, myself included, have asked questions for the past year and a half of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) and other ministers as to when there will be legislation or direction which will tell the railways that their business is not simply that of transporting goods across the country but, also, that of transporting people and facilitating the transportation of people.

### *Relocation of Railway Lines*

**Mr. Woolliams:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Harney:** Obviously, not everybody in this House comes from Toronto. Some of us do. Those of us who come from Toronto know of the enormous problem we face in urban transport. Despite that, the city of Toronto over the years has developed one of the finer urban transit systems in North America. Although it is good, it is by no means good enough.

In Toronto a major study was undertaken recently relating to the Scarborough Expressway, an expressway which was to have extended from the eastern part of the city. That study, produced under the direction of Dr. Richard Soberman who at one time worked either for the Department of Transport or the Department of Urban Affairs—

**Mr. Basford:** Transport.

**Mr. Harney:**—recommended that the expressway not be built. That was a milestone recommendation in the history or urban development in Canada. Further, instead of recommending some kind of Flash Gordon, super levitation, Kraus Maffei, linear induction, super technology project, the study recommended that we go to light rail transit. Simply put, the report recommended the use of super streetcars. But in order to make the light rail transit system for Metro Toronto possible in a financial and concrete sense, the rights of way owned by the railways would have to be made available to the Toronto Transit Commission, or whatever commission will be responsible for light rail transit.

I cannot describe the map of the area. Anyone who looks at the Soberman report will see immediately that the whole area in question is crisscrossed in the most intelligent and effective way by main railway lines, branch lines, feeder lines and what-have-you, which could be used to provide a means for letting the people of the area travel to work and back without disrupting the existing amenities of the area. Obviously this is one of the most sensible and least expensive ways of moving people about in our urban centres. I commend the minister, not for having listened to the questions asked in this House, but for having had the good sense to include this provision in the bill before us. I can see it can certainly be made use of by many of our urban centres.

● (1750)

That was a piece of good news. Now for another worry. We in this corner of the House are a bit fretful. I, among others, am a little worried because the railways might find this bill so much to their advantage. Under the guise of offering a better environment to the people of our urban communities, under the guise of removing the track slums in certain sections of our communities, or under the guise of the beautification of our communities, this bill may simply permit the railways to offer to move themselves, again in co-operation with the municipalities, away from downtown areas.

Surely at first many people would laud this kind of a move, but there may be a trap here. We have had much painful evidence in the past few years of the desire of railway companies to move out of the passenger business.