

The Budget—Mr. Chappell

introduce this innovation at Malton, but there is no reason why it could not work for the new airport in the lake.

The U.S. Federal Aviation Report and other similar studies seem to verify that if deemed advisable in future, a floating runway which would be further out in the lake could be tied to the first runway. This would only happen if technological improvements in noise and pollution control made it reasonable. Needless to say, such an airport would be of tremendous advantage to the Toronto business community and add to the desirability of Toronto as a convention centre. Cleveland has already demonstrated the advantages of a second downtown airport.

The whole development would provide Toronto with a new assessment of perhaps \$2 billion. All of this is being held up by the jungle of jurisdiction. Although by the 1911 act the Commission became the owner of much of the harbour bottom, the federal-provincial agreement in 1960 muddied the waters to the extent that it is difficult now to say who owns the water lots to the west of the western channel, which is about south of Bathurst Street.

The plan was some years in conception and development but this will appear like a glimpse of time before we move to achievement unless the nightmare of jurisdictional conflict is solved. The Ontario government has commenced construction of Ontario Place on some of the land where the ownership is not clear, and has recently announced an intention to build Harbour City. Ownership or claims to ownership of the land upon which Harbour City is to be built lie with five authorities, the province of Ontario, the city of Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto, the federal government and the Toronto Harbour Commission. Right now the commission cannot go ahead with Harbour City until the federal government agrees to dredge a new eastern channel, and it cannot proceed with the land fill operations for the outer harbour and the new airport until the airport is approved.

The Department of Transport has a special group looking for a second major airport site and another group studying over-all aviation needs, but there does not seem to be sufficient attention to this problem, namely, the development of the Toronto waterfront. In comparing federal expenditure on the Toronto waterfront during the last five years with its expenditure in Montreal and Halifax we see that Toronto has received very little.

Recently the press reported an outcry against the possibility of planes flying over the eastern beaches, but I noted in a press clipping of December 16, 1969, that the De Havilland Company demonstrated that their new inter-city plane creates very little noise and pollution compared with present jets. I understand it is completely feasible to use the smaller and quieter 48 seat planes which will be ready by 1972.

The Harbour Commission has authority to expropriate and could perhaps proceed on its own, but on the other hand its record has always been one of co-operation and consideration for the needs of the community as a whole. In any event, however, it would still have to be financed by and be responsible to the four levels of government, and finally to the people. Again, according to the press, the major parties have been exchanging views, but will they reach a solution, and that soon enough, unless there is some definite and obvious approach?

In 1911, on the petition of the City of Toronto, the federal government legislated a joint venture between them which has worked amazingly well for almost 60 years. The Toronto Harbour Commission was the pattern for other commission ports. Now, it can be up-dated as a pattern for tri-level governmental endeavours. Metro Toronto and Ontario are, of course, equally interested.

The solution can be found in the three simple amendments to the Harbour Commissioners Act, contained in the bill which I introduced on March 6. In short they are:

1. The name of the act could be changed to the Metropolitan Toronto Harbour Commissioners Act or the Metropolitan Toronto Water Front Act.

2. Instead of the appointment of five commissioners, three by Toronto, one by the federal government and one on the recommendation of the Board of Trade, section 7 of the act could be amended to provide that one be appointed by the federal government, who should be an elected federal member from Metropolitan Toronto, one by the provincial government who should be an elected representative to the legislative assembly from Metropolitan Toronto, one of its elected members by Toronto Council, one of its elected members by Metropolitan Council, and one upon the recommendation of the Board of Trade.

3. Section 5 of the act could be amended to provide that the boundaries would be from the east and west limits of Metropolitan