

The Address—Mr. Davis

opened for river traffic and may remain open for half an hour or more at a time. This is hardly good enough. Obviously this constitutes a vacuum. We have a lack not only of co-operation but of vision, a lack of over-all planning. We have a need for co-operation, and I believe we need to have greater initiative shown at the federal level in order to obviate problems of this kind.

These are only two specific examples. There are undoubtedly many other places served by excellent national modes of transportation, such as Air Canada, C.P.A., the C.N.R., pipe lines and so on which face similar problems. When the air line has delivered its passengers near the city, when the rail line has unloaded its passengers near the major metropolitan centre, the passengers are immediately confronted with difficult problems of transportation. The rest of their journey is difficult. But it need not be difficult. These inconveniences are time consuming, and time means money. This means inefficiency, it means we are less productive than we might be.

Having so few people and such great distances it is a shame that, with the benefits of modern technology which tend to reduce the penalty of distance, we are still living with a penalty of distance in Canada which is man made. It is a penalty of distance which is largely confined to our big metropolitan areas. It is within our ability to solve, but the initiative must rest in good part with the federal government to help tidy up the situation.

I suggest that basically the federal government take just as comprehensive an approach to the problems of urban development as it has taken to the problems of rural readjustment and development, that it take a comprehensive attitude, that it take a constructive attitude, that it be not too afraid of provincial and local jurisdictions, that it move into what is obviously a vacuum, and where the local jurisdictions are both willing and financially capable to assume their appropriate roles, they will certainly do so.

We do need at least at the federal level a body of expertise, a repository of information. We require not only research but a group of high level planners, if you like, who can be consulted by our local planners in order that, nationally we may do more efficiently what we would otherwise have to do separately and sporadically in various metropolitan areas across the country.

I now want to focus my observations more directly on the problem of transportation, particularly highway transportation in our

[Mr. Davis.]

cities. We will undoubtedly be building more thoroughways. We may also in the fullness of time be concerned with the redevelopment, that is the establishment of new modes of rapid transit in Canada. We shall have to pay for these new developments and they will be very expensive developments.

Anyone who has visited the city of Los Angeles, that great and sprawling megalopolis with a population roughly half of that of all of Canada, cannot help but be appalled by the vast acreage of pavement, of roads, streets and highways, which extend throughout the city. I am told that as much as 25 per cent of the total land area of the city of Los Angeles is paved over. We can learn from the experience of Los Angeles.

Recently I read an article attributed to two engineers, one of whom used to live in my riding in Vancouver. I see they are now both resident in Toronto. In the article, which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on September 9, 1966, they are quoted as saying to the Good Roads Association of Canada that:

Canadian urban areas are moving toward a density of 6,000 persons to the square mile.

They go on to say:

A circle of ten miles radius at this density contains 1,800,000 persons; within a radius of 100 miles there would be 180 million persons.

This is the sort of megalopolis toward which we are moving. They go on to say:

Irrespective of the size, it can be served well by a simple grid of high-standard transportation corridors at approximately three-mile spacing, containing immediately high-standard freeways, but with provision for future automatic ways and/or transit. In addition, there are urban arterials at one-mile spacing.

• (5:30 p.m.)

They go on to say that these transportation facilities require about 18 per cent of the land. In their view efficient transportation arrangements might reduce the figure of 25 per cent for Los Angeles to 18 per cent for Toronto. One can imagine the immense saving not only in land but also in money, time and materials if planning on this scale were commenced at a relatively early date in the history of our major cities.

They also say that the total capital investment for transportation facilities is about \$500 per capita, assuming the land to have been purchased before development. They say that distributing this cost over 20 years gives \$25 per capita per year, which is less than the current expenditure on urban roads and streets in Canada. In other words we can have a better system of transportation in our