

What the Hon. Mr. Robarts said in 1968 has become even clearer in 1972. The pressures on the provincial and municipal governments are even more severe now than they were in those days. Of course, one of the things that has added greatly to the financial pressures and the difficulties of our municipal governments—and I think this is particularly true of our larger urban governments—has been the vast growth in their welfare costs, the vast increase in the amounts they have to spend toward providing welfare for their residents as a result of the great increase in unemployment that has taken place during the last two or three years. This is directly attributable to the policies deliberately adopted by the present government. We have had massive unemployment, and as a result of this, a massive rise in welfare costs. It really does not help the municipalities any more than it helps anybody else for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to go around talking about how many vacant jobs there are in the country.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** So far as our municipalities are concerned, they have been confronted by this vast increase in welfare expenditures which they have had to make as the result of federal policies, and this has added tremendously to their difficulties in discharging their other responsibilities and carrying out plans to meet the needs of citizens in these large communities. So, to begin with, the federal government should certainly share a far larger proportion of this welfare load that the municipal governments are carrying as a result of the policies of the federal government. Over and above that, because the federal government has created this problem for the municipal governments and for cities, it should be even more active, even more energetic in trying to co-operate with the provinces and municipalities in reaching solutions to these urgent problems faced by our cities.

But going beyond the present situation, going beyond the present difficulties that the municipal governments and our cities face, there are serious and urgent matters that have to be considered. There has to be some sort of national urban strategy concerned with the environment in which the great majority of Canadians work, live and play, and in which an increasing number of Canadians are going to spend their lives. In saying this, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the existence of constitutional problems. I recognize the presence of the constitutional question and the fact that it cannot be just shunted aside. But I also maintain that the constitution cannot be used as an excuse for the federal government to ignore the urban problems, as it has largely tended to do up to this time.

I am saying that the federal government must involve itself in working out a national approach to some of these problems. I want to emphasize that the provinces must always be involved in these discussions, these consultations and these policies. I am not suggesting for a moment, and I would be very much against the government of Canada in Ottawa, or even this parliament imposing plans in this area on the provinces, simply laying down here by edict, by law—if this could be done constitutionally—some program that the provinces and the cities would have to accept whether they wished to or not.

#### *Federal Co-operation in Urban Problems*

I want to emphasize that this has to be a co-operative effort in which the federal government has a role to play, but in which the provinces as well as the cities must always be involved. When I talk about the need for a national strategy with regard to growing urban problems, I am certainly not suggesting that there should be some rigid national policies set down with which all the cities in the country have to comply. Again, even if that were constitutionally possible it would certainly be undesirable because each city in this country has its own individual profile of problems, of opportunities, and of goals. Each one has its own character resulting from the ethnic mix in that city, its industrial base, its geographic location, and all sorts of other characteristics of which we can all think. Every city has its special quality and there could be no rigid national policy that would fit the needs of all our cities, even if it were constitutionally possible to devise such a policy.

At the same time there are problems such as the tax base, such as relations between the federal government and the provinces with regard to municipal problems; there are problems involving research and co-ordination of research in relation to transportation matters. Indeed, there are many aspects of urban life that are common to all our cities. I have to say that the visible rate of progress toward effective co-operation between all three levels of government in fighting in some common way these urban problems is very disappointing.

The Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities pointed out in its brief in 1970 that there is a growing inconsistency between the low constitutional status of the city and its actual role in the lives of the people. I quote briefly:

Changes in Canadian social, economic and political organization, stimulated by the increasing demands of urbanization will soon, we believe, make new approaches to the fundamental questions of governmental organization and structure inevitable.

But we have to work with things as they are, for the time being at least. We have to work with the constitution as it now is. And regardless of what one may feel as to whether the cities are adequately recognized under our constitution, I certainly endorse the federation suggestion that municipal governments should be recognized as de facto partners in all discussions of their problems. Any attempt to ignore their existence and proceed without their participation would certainly be unrealistic. It would be virtually unthinkable.

I recognize that an approach has been made towards a process of tripartite involvement in urban affairs, involving federal, provincial and municipal governments. This has been going on for some years in such areas as housing, and I recognize that this approach has to be broadened so as to include some structure that would provide for discussion generally among the three levels of governments of urban and municipal problems. This kind of approach would seem to be the only sensible procedure to follow because all three levels of government have their contributions to make in finding solutions to urban problems.

There should not be any attempt by any higher level of government, and certainly not by the federal government, to take over. There is certainly no reason for confronta-