

Finance suggests his budget is expansionary. These are examples of lack of co-ordination.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that within the field of transportation as it affects a growing number of city dwellers, in a society that is moving from agrarian to urban living, there will for the first time be the element of co-ordination which is needed and which was not present hitherto. I know the hon. member for Ottawa East will applaud those sentiments.

Mr. Charles Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to address the House on the subject of transportation. You will forgive me if I do not limit my remarks to the terms of reference of the so-called national urban transportation authority which the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) would have this House consider.

When first reading the proposed legislation I was dismayed to see we were being asked to create yet another government agency. Upon further study, my dismay gave way to anxiety when the implications of what was being proposed became clearer. Bill C-26 is irrelevant to the emerging pattern of urbanization in this country. More importantly, it contains elements of constitutional discord. The hon. member is suggesting that we circumvent or run afoul of existing provincial jurisdiction by setting up regional federal authorities with local powers. Can he be serious? Or is he, like the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), talking of direct dealings with cities, clearly the responsibility of the provinces, for some political gain?

There is more to dealing with issues than introducing new concepts without consideration of all the factors. There is more to coming to grips with an immensely complex issue like urban transportation than merely creating yet another agency, yet another authority. There is much more to rationalizing the existing laws and regulations and jurisdictions that govern transportation in this country. Creating still another tribunal is not going to work toward the creation of viable urban transportation policies—

Mr. Stevens: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is misunderstanding the bill when he suggests that somehow there is a jurisdictional problem. The bill is very careful to deal only with railways, air transportation and harbours which are all federal matters. It is simply proposing that "urbanwise" they be put into separate regions.

Mr. Turner (London East): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the details, but I know what I am talking about. I have been interested in transportation for 33 years, so I know a little about it. In fact, this bill would have quite the contrary effect, further delaying the day when hon. members can speak intelligently about a matter that is of crucial national, provincial and local interest. Urban transportation is of crucial interest countrywide. That is the point this government wishes to make when it

Urban Transportation

introduces legislation, as it will shortly when the railway relocation measures are placed before the House. This government has not been idle about transportation, especially urban transportation.

I should perhaps remind hon. members that there already exist government agencies that deal with transportation on a day to day and on a long-range basis. There is the regulatory body, the Canadian Transport Commission, that has a direct role in doing exactly what the hon. member would have the new legislation do, namely, improve rail, air and water traffic. There is the Department of Transport, which last year, with expenditures of \$409.2 million, was in the business of doing exactly what Bill C-26 would do; that is, promoting and improving rail, air and water passenger traffic; not only passenger traffic to urban centres in Canada but also the movement of goods across the country and between cities.

The Department of Transport has also entered new fields. In 1971-72 a major national highway policy was set in motion which includes participation with all provincial governments. A federal-provincial advisory council on motor carrier regulations was created. The development of a transportation strategy for the Canadian northwest was started. Through greater participation with other governmental and private institutions, new and more advanced transportation systems are being developed. These initiatives all have impact, in one way or another, on urban transportation.

I am only skimming the surface in pointing out these examples. The point to be made here is that the government is fully aware of the need to improve urban transportation. But more important than this awareness is the conviction that planning new strategies, be they in transportation or any other area, demands a co-ordinated orchestration of all the elements involved, not simply the creation of another agency.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member for interrupting his remarks, but it is six o'clock. Before the Chair calls it six o'clock, I believe the parliamentary secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Reid) wishes to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the House leaders concerning the special debate on penitentiaries that was raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). I believe there is agreement to debate a substantive resolution which would read as follows:

That the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs be empowered to investigate the administration of the penitentiary system, including security, parole and temporary absences, and that it report its recommendations as soon as reasonable after a thorough inquiry.

I believe it is further agreed that there be a limit of 15 minutes on speeches, that at the conclusion of the debate the motion be deemed to have been adopted, and that the motion be non-amendable. I think the House would be agreeable to accepting that motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed and so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.