

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, following briefly in the footsteps of my colleague, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), in addition to his qualifications I should like to suggest that in a couple of areas the wording of the bill is a little vague. The word "vicinity" to the best of my knowledge is not used normally in preparing legislation of this kind because it does not really define any specific area. I would think that some of the wording of legislation used by the Ontario municipal board in its planning processes, and so on, today might well be applied to this legislation.

I intend, along with my colleagues, to allow this bill to go to committee, rather than talk it out as is usually the case with most of the bills presented by the opposition. But I do intend to watch for it when it gets before committee and to ask that some changes be made. For example, four weeks' notice does not seem to be ample enough to me. At certain times of the year four weeks' notice may well be sufficient; but if you put a notice in a newspaper in the second week of July, for example, until the second week of August, a lot of people would be on holiday and would not see the notice. I think there are times when much longer notice than four weeks is required.

I have had a bit of experience of matters of this sort, Mr. Speaker. Not long ago I was directly involved, as mayor of the city of Belleville, in the removal of a major rail line from the centre of the main street of Belleville, a line that had been there since time began, as near as I could tell. The track was very old, and I must say that the sight of a CN locomotive and a number of cars going down the main street past the main offices and the main hotel in town had to be seen to be believed. We took this track up and, as a matter of fact, I have a slice of it on my desk today as a memento. But we are faced in Belleville with another problem, and this is the relocation of the CP track along the waterfront of Belleville. It is a very beautiful waterfront except for the scar placed there by the Canadian Pacific. That rail line, as someone else mentioned, but I forget who, was put there at a time when the railway companies used an awful lot of muscle to force their way into areas where they were not really wanted and certainly could not go now.

● (1750)

If the relocation legislation of the federal government were at all worth while we would have that track out of the south end of Belleville and the entire south end would be that much better for it.

I want to comment briefly on two things. I was disappointed by the cheap shot taken by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young) at the Ontario government in this regard. I have found in the past in dealing with that government that it has been most co-operative in having this sort of thing looked after immediately. I find that it is the relocation legislation of the federal government that is at fault in this area.

I could not help but take a little bit of a look at the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) who says he has the support of the entire 12-man council of the borough of Scarborough. I have spent a good many years in municipal

Railway Act

councils, and when I last looked there were at least two attractive ladies on that council and I am sure they are not going to be very happy about being dealt with in that very chauvinistic manner by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

As the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) has said, this is a substantive matter and one that we intend to allow to go to the committee. I think the opposition party has shown some leadership in respect to this matter that has not been obvious in respect to private members' bills of an equally substantive nature in past years. To my knowledge, in the short time I have been in this House this is an unprecedented step. I shall be interested to see what government action follows this action on the part of the opposition taking a positive step to allow a private member's bill through the House. This is a matter that will obviously be of some benefit to a particular section of the country, in the riding of the hon. member for Scarborough West, as well as of benefit to all the citizens of Canada in that it does relate to all Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I see the time moving toward the normal hour of adjournment so I am going to sit down and allow this matter to be referred to the committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion of the hon. member. Is it agreed that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At 5.55 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.