

The Budget—Mr. Chappell

Toronto. They could be extended later further to the west and to the east if deemed advisable. Needless to say, although the new commission would have full responsibility for the development, land created for parks or Harbour City would be turned over to Metro and Toronto. I just cannot imagine the Toronto Harbour Commission, or the province through its appointee, trying to take over and operate such a large part of the city.

o (4:00 p.m.)

I can understand some fear on the part of each government involved that they might be creating a monster they could not control but, on the other hand, all would be from Ontario and metropolitan Toronto and they would represent the city, the province and the country as a whole. They would be able to maintain constant liaison between the four levels of government and their technical and planning departments and the business community. They would hear the briefs, and have the power to act, but they would not be able to be unrealistic in that they would still require financing to some extent from the four levels of government and would still be answerable to the electorate. For those who are concerned about a blending of the costs or income of the various divisions of activity the authority, under its by-laws, could divide its jurisdiction into port administration and development.

Finally, I suggest that Toronto once again petition the federal government to have the federal act updated to meet present requirements. The first real step was the act of God which opened the eastern gap; the second was the petition from Toronto which produced the Toronto Harbour Commission Act in 1911. We cannot wait for another act of God, but Toronto could petition again for a change in the act. This single authority would relieve the fears recently expressed by metro chairman, Ab Campbell and Toronto Mayor William Dennison and I am sure gain their full support. I ask that the government adopt Bill C-195 as a government bill and have it referred to committee so that witnesses from the various levels of government concerned may be heard and, finally, the necessary legislation passed.

In conclusion, the purpose for this regional authority being so structured is to bring together in a practical co-ordinated way all the forces of government which operate in a geographic area known as the port of Toronto

[Mr. Chappell.]

and to do so with a minimum of bureaucratic redundancy and financial outlay—only all the people would gain.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I sought to introduce a motion under Standing Order 26 to ask the House to consider the staggering unemployment figures released by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics today. His Honour decided that the debate should not be allowed on the ground that the House is now discussing the budget and that this gave ample scope for discussing unemployment or any other question. I was perfectly aware, of course, that the budget debate was in progress. My purpose in introducing the motion under Standing Order 26 was in the hope that we could get the government to answer specific questions with respect to the unemployment situation and to outline what steps it intends to take to deal with it.

We have been debating this budget since last Monday and there have been no statements from any ministers of the Crown, except the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) who introduced the budget. We have not heard from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) as to what his department is going to do about unemployment nor from the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) as to what changes are to be made in his program to deal with increased unemployment. We have heard nothing at all from the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), whose responsibility it is to deal with the underdeveloped areas of this country, areas where the figures show that not only has unemployment increased but the number of employed persons has declined. This means that not only have we failed to provide jobs for those entering the labour market, but we have not been able to keep in employment those who were employed a year ago.

Surely, the House and the country is entitled to some statement from these ministers but they have taken no part in the debate, they are not here—even the Minister of Finance is not here. The only minister present is the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) who was a former minister of finance. Like Frankenstein, he created the monster that he now sits and watches with misgivings lest it destroy those who created it.

The government cannot just sit and ignore this problem, Mr. Speaker. I think we have the right to insist that before this debate