

floor, but two points of order have been raised by another hon. member. This is a motion concerning transportation, and airport facilities and air service are transportation matters; but perhaps the hon. member is dwelling too much on the specific question that concerns his riding. In order to help the Chair and the House, the hon. member should debate the motion before the House.

Mr. Cafik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall certainly do that and I hope the House understands why I was trying to deal with these important matters. I am sorry that it is not possible to do it, because they are of great concern to the people whose properties may be taken for the building of a second international airport. Certainly in my view, this comes under the heading of transportation policy. However, in view of the objection of the NDP, I will confine my remarks to other areas. They are also related specifically to the airport problem as well as to the general complex problem of transportation in Canada.

• (2050)

If we had a proper transportation policy which was clearly enunciated, some of the views and concerns of people in my area would be somewhat alleviated. People have the impression that this government, particularly in relation to the project I have spoken about, has a minister of aviation and not a Minister of Transport. It is important that the government make it perfectly clear that they are concerned about all avenues of transportation and have taken into consideration rapid transit systems right across Canada in order to minimize the volume of air traffic at the present time or that which is projected for the future.

The projection for the Toronto region is that by the year 2000 there will be approximately 60 million air passengers per year. To many people this appears to be an absurd projection. If there were proper means of transporting people in the short haul, this figure could possibly be reduced and perhaps some of the air transportation facilities which are presently being projected would not in fact be needed.

It seems to be relevant to this question that the government make perfectly clear their over-all plans in terms of building a rapid transit corridor across Ontario and into Quebec, at least from Montreal to Toronto, which would alleviate much of the need for air transportation. As a matter of fact, in the long run I think it is essential to have a transportation corridor from Quebec City through to Windsor. This would have a very beneficial effect in another area, by allowing the spread of urbanization over a much larger area of land across Ontario and Quebec rather than concentrating it in areas like Montreal and Toronto. There are many who feel that the prospect of a Toronto with eight million people is not socially acceptable. I feel we ought to express our reservations in this regard.

I would like to talk for a moment about a couple of other points. The first is urban transportation in the Toronto region. Some time ago, on June 3, 1970, I suggested in writing to the Minister of Transport that we required certain amendments to the railway acts of this country in order to give more emphasis to commuter transportation. In that letter I suggested that four amendments would be

National Transportation Policy

advisable in terms of transportation policy for urban areas of Canada. The first was to spell out in legislation that the CNR and the CPR make railbeds available for the purpose of commuter transportation in a better way than they had in the past. My second suggestion was as follows:

To force the railways to give preferential time schedules for such purposes, even though it may require adjustments to freight schedules.

This is important because at the moment urban transportation running on rail lines is often confined to hours which are not socially acceptable to the working population of these areas. My third suggestion was:

To force the railroad to charge reasonable mileage rates for commuters. Some believe that the present wheel mileage rates are excessive—

Others feel that there should be a preferential rate even if it requires some subsidization. Then fourth:

To force railroads to allow other individuals or agencies to use these rail beds for urban transport purposes. It is suggested that private enterprise itself may be interested in bidding on urban transport routes in the metropolitan area, and the act would have to be changed to allow such individuals to use these railbeds.

An hon. Member: Where do you stand?

Mr. Cafik: I subscribe to those suggestions in view of the fact that I made them. A member of the New Democratic Party asked, as he often does, where I stand. I clearly stand for the suggestions I have made. There are a number of areas that we need to explore in terms of transportation policy so that the policy will have some worth-while effect on the ecology and the problems of urban sprawl. Such a policy will have a very important and meaningful part to play in the way in which this country is developed for the good of all Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I looked forward with a great deal of anticipation to this debate. I know that I speak for most people in Atlantic Canada when I say that I hoped the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) would make a far reaching and useful statement regarding a transportation policy for that part of Canada.

After listening to the minister I can only say that in the time I have been in this House I have never been more disappointed by what was said in so far as Atlantic transportation is concerned. I think it is fair to say that in nine months, the normal pregnancy period, the minister brought forth an abortion as far as Atlantic transportation policy is concerned. It is worse than useless. It is a grave and deep disappointment for every resident of Atlantic Canada. The Minister of Transport spent most of his time talking about an air policy. As far as transportation in the Atlantic provinces is concerned, everything is certainly up in the air now.

Immediate action must be taken to overcome the many additional problems that have been created for industries in the Atlantic provinces since the spring of 1969 when the four Atlantic provinces' premiers presented to the Minister of Transport their long-range proposals for a realistic Atlantic area transportation policy. On September 2, 1969, the federal government produced its alternative policy to