

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

If it is so good and proper, why were we never presented with the reason for its existence; and if it is so bad, why were we not told about it? With those questions I close my case, and I would like an answer from those who respond on behalf of the greatest police force in the world.

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): I can assure the hon. member that nothing, as he has suggested, has slipped through the tight net of government spending. If the hon. member had listened carefully to the remarks made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) in this House he would realize that this group was not set up to advise the RCMP, as he suggested, nor is it a part of the RCMP.

A proposal for the establishment of the security, planning and research group in the headquarters of the Department of the Solicitor General was submitted to the government in April of 1971. The group is established to study the nature, origin and causes of subversive and revolutionary action, its objectives and techniques, as well as the measures necessary to protect Canadians from internal threats, and to compile and analyse information collected on subversive and revolutionary groups and their activities, to estimate the nature and scope of internal threats to Canadians and to plan for measures to counter these threats, and to advise the Solicitor General in respect of these matters so that he can properly advise the government.

In that regard the government approved the establishment of the group in May, 1971, and subsequently positions were authorized for eight officers, three stenographers and one clerk. Colonel Bourne, of whom the hon. member has spoken, was seconded from the Department of National Defence. His salary is paid by that department and will be reimbursed by the Department of Solicitor General as and when this Parliament authorizes funds for it to do so.

One other member of the group was also seconded from the Department of National Defence and another from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Their salaries, likewise, are being paid by those establishments and will be recoverable from the Department of the Solicitor General on the same basis as that of Colonel Bourne. The remainder of the group are members of the public service of Canada. The government considered the need to establish this group on a priority basis. Other positions in the headquarters of the Department of the Solicitor General which had become vacant were utilized so as to provide for recruitment action on a priority basis.

Funds for the reimbursement of salaries to the Department of National Defence, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to pay the salaries of the remaining members of the group will be found in vote 1 of the estimates of the Department of the Solicitor General and, if sufficient funds are not available in vote 1, in further supplementary estimates, something which was mentioned before the supplementary estimates committee the other day.

As of this date, of the eight officers, three stenographers and one clerk currently authorized by Treasury Board, six officers and three stenographers have been hired and are carrying out the duties of the group as described by the Solicitor General in his statement to the House on

September 21, 1971. Any inquiries in respect of the group can be made any time that vote 1 of the estimates of the Department of the Solicitor General is before the House of Commons or the appropriate committee.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—METRO
DEVELOPMENT CENTRE, TORONTO—ALLEGED
AGREEMENT TO DEMOLISH UNION STATION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, on November 16 I directed a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) inquiring whether Canadian National Railways had entered into an agreement with Metro Development Centre, Toronto, to sell Union Station and, if so, did the federal government agree with the demolition of Union Station. The answer the minister gave was as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member I believe is aware that it is a consortium that is planning what is commonly referred to as Metro Centre. It has the full support of the government. We have given a good deal of assistance to the main parties concerned in order to get it going. One of the objectives is a new terminal, and I believe this involves the destruction of Union Station, but I would assume that the decision whether it is to be destroyed or not would be up to the municipal—

I imagine he wanted to finish by saying “the municipality of the city of Toronto.” Mr. Speaker, why is it up to the municipality of the city of Toronto to determine the destruction of Union Station in Toronto? May I remind hon. members that this Union Station land is comprised of approximately nine acres, is owned by the city of Toronto but is subject to a renewable lease of 21 years, in perpetuity, to the railway companies.

In a report by the development commissioner to the executive committee of the city of Toronto on May 6, 1971, the commissioner stated that the maximum value of the nine acres would be in the region of \$50 million if it were unencumbered. The encumbrance is the lease to the railways which they obtained at the turn of the century. After obtaining it, subject to a clause which says it must be used for railway purposes only, they proceeded to rent 15 per cent of the land to the Post Office. In 1939 the federal government expropriated the 15 per cent that had been acquired by the Post Office.

• (10:10 p.m.)

In 1946, in determining the compensation for the land that had been expropriated the Exchequer Court said that the encumbrance had no real effect with regard to the value of the land in question. So you have the development commissioner setting a value of \$50 million and the real estate experts of the railway company setting the value at \$1,500,000, and next the city says they will give it a realistic value of \$9,500,000. The question arises, Mr. Speaker, where has the \$40 million gone? Perhaps the answer lies in the attitude of the railway which wants to construct the new terminal just south of the Union Station because they know that the present site has greater marketability as a commercial site. I would think that is the reason for the difference in the valuations.

More important are the esthetic qualities of the Union Station. I have with me a picture of Union Station which I wish I could distribute to all members of the House. I wish it could be printed in *Hansard* because it shows its majes-