

sion of the legislatures. I do not know why. Did they consider at that time that it was ancillary to the powers of the provinces to organize the courts? It certainly is ancillary to criminal matters, of course, which are within the province of the federal jurisdiction. In any event, we may be doing something which will have no further consequence. It may not pass the other place only by our giving third reading to this bill here today. However, at least the introduction of this bill here will have had, as a result, the correction of the situation which we wanted to correct. I think we should congratulate Senator Fergusson for having done that. By giving the bill third reading we will be telling the people of Canada that the Senate has taken a stand on this matter. Even if the bill never receives royal assent, the situation has been corrected anyway, and under the circumstances we have done a wise thing.

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.

URBAN AFFAIRS

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, May 25, the adjourned debate on the inquiry of Hon. Mr. Thompson calling the attention of the Senate to the Report prepared for the Minister responsible for Housing entitled: "Urban Canada: Problems and Prospects", tabled in the Senate on Tuesday, 9th March, 1971.

[Translation]

Hon. Paul Desruisseaux: Honourable senators, I think this is an appropriate moment to address my colleagues on a matter which is currently generating a great deal of interest among the whole population.

Last June, I expressed my intention to address my honourable colleagues after Senator Thompson who, quite appropriately, drew our attention to the Lithwick Report entitled "Urban Canada: Problems and Prospects" prepared for the minister responsible for housing and tabled in early March 1971.

Since every Canadian is directly involved in this every day of his life, this is obviously for us one of our most important political as well as social and economic problems. In view of the town planning projections for the next generation, one can see its vital consequences on our future and that of our children.

Senator Thompson made a contribution to the Senate with his excellent criticism of that report. The report followed numerous studies, important articles, a large number of publications and many recommendations of commissions which in recent years have gathered for us ample information on Canadian town planning.

May I mention, by the way, some of the other most famous and most recent Canadian works on the same subject: "Urban Development in Canada", by Leroy O. Stone; "The Urban Renewal Process in Canada", published by the University of British Columbia; and "Planning the Canadian Environment" by L. O. Gertler.

It is a fact that Canada ranks today among the five most urbanized countries in the world. Like the United

States, and in spite of the vastness of the country, the Canadian population is 75 per cent urban, a too large proportion of which is now considered as poor.

It is also well known that the interest shown by Canadian authorities in town planning has also grown in this country, obviously because of the increasing number of urban problems.

[English]

Many will remember the report of the Task Force on Housing and Urban Development submitted in 1969 to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister by the Honourable Paul Hellyer, then minister responsible for housing and urban affairs. Between 350 and 400 briefs were submitted and studied at that time. Obviously, the former minister, Mr. Hellyer, thought the problem truly important, since he himself presided over the majority of the meetings across Canada. Moreover, some ten Canadian universities saw fit to take part in the study of this report, entitled "Program of Action for an Urban Canada", and the report was tabled in January 1969. No doubt many of you will recall Mr. Hellyer's anxiety in respect of this report and his impatience to have its recommendations adopted. You will also recall that the report contained a declaration of principles in ten parts. These principles were widely discussed and evaluated; some, involving political philosophies, were quite hotly debated because they were considered controversial. The last principle enumerated can be stated somewhat as follows:

To realize a full efficiency the urban planning must be undertaken in a realistic constitutional and geographical context as free as possible from artificial, political, economical and social encumbrances.

A great many aspects of urban development and appropriate projections were seriously treated in the report. My point is that in spite of so much concern, so much interest, so many studies and so many important recommendations, this report was set aside. It was shelved.

It was Doxiadis, a Greek planner who had made quite a name for himself, who once commented that a planner who is unable to sell his plan to the people and their politicians has no plan at all—just a piece of paper. Attention is now again directed to a new urban report—the Lithwick Report—made to the present Minister of State for Urban Affairs, Mr. Robert Andras.

I believe it would be useful to state at this time what the former minister responsible for housing, Mr. Hellyer, wrote a few months ago in an article entitled "Today's Inaccessible Housing". I quote:

In Canada we have a Constitution that was designed for the society and problems of 1867. In many ways it has shown itself remarkable. In other ways it is antiquated and all too often its potential flexibility is denied in order to justify inaction.

The British North America Act places primary responsibility for housing at the provincial level. At the same time, the federal Government has power