

tion policy for a moment. I think all hon. members probably realize that I inherited the proposed airport at Pickering which has caused me considerable grief. I recommended, of course, an independent inquiry, which is now sitting on that question. I certainly hope that the inquiry and the Department of Transport bear in mind questions such as the short fuel supply, and so on, and the fact that these are non-renewable resources. I hope they consider the steps we need to take in terms of a future transportation policy in regard to commuter transit over short distances, say within 50 miles of major cities.

I am not saying that such a system would automatically rule out a second airport for Toronto, but it would have a tendency to go in that direction. I am not an expert on whether airports are needed or not, but I think the department and the independent inquiry should bear in mind any new steps taken by the government of Canada toward a transportation policy which might affect the decision which was originally taken and sustained. The independent inquiry would be well advised to take into consideration all the relevant factors on the whole question of transportation which have come to light within the last six or eight months.

There has been some mention of housing and I have a question in respect of that problem. Much to my surprise, there appears to be a rather broad base of agreement on such questions as land banking and providing federal and provincial funds therefor. That seems to be the conventional wisdom today. But I have grave reservations about land banking and the development of "instant" cities. It seems to me that proper development in this country ought to occur around existing communities and should not create instantaneous communities such as the type suggested east of Toronto. An example is the Cedarwood development, which is nothing before it starts and when it is over it will not be very much. In terms of being a social unit it will not provide for the real needs of human beings who want to live close together.

If we are making the mistake of going heavily into land banking, it seems to me we are encouraging the development of large banks of land around the large cities. The cities will take advantage of this, not the smaller communities; therefore we will be providing an incentive to make our large urban areas even larger. That scares me a great deal, Mr. Speaker. I think cities such as Toronto are big enough now. We need expansion around the smaller communities. I think such expansion would solve not only the housing crisis but would have a beneficial effect on the price of land. There should not be large-scale developments concentrated in one area, if this was avoided a much more meaningful kind of human environment would be provided wherein people could live and raise their children. This is basically going into the past, but in the past small communities have provided a great deal. We should be very careful before we destroy that kind of thing for new and novel schemes which may temporarily appeal to many people. We may find that we have made a serious social mistake.

**Mr. Baker:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I realize that we gave unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue, and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) did put up his hand with two fingers

*The Address—Mr. MacKay*

outstretched. I also realize that there is no limitation once consent is given. But I wonder, through you, sir, if I could ask my hon. friend to terminate his remarks, interesting as they are. There are other hon. members who wish to speak. I wonder if I could ask Your Honour's indulgence.

**Mr. Speaker:** I tend to disagree with the hon. member's interpretation of the rule; I think there is the right to withdraw consent. I do not believe the fact that the House gave the hon. member consent to continue gives him leave to continue indefinitely. I do not think the hon. member proposes to do that, but if hon. members at this time wish to withdraw their unanimous consent, he would have to yield the floor.

**An hon. Member:** He is going to say, "In conclusion".

**Mr. Cafik:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the House. I thought, from all the smiles on the other side, that hon. members were very much in agreement and wanted me to continue. In conclusion, I very much favour the establishment of a human rights and interests commission as suggested in the Speech from the Throne. I say, too, that I believe if we all work together as parliamentarians rather than as members of a particular party, this second session of the twenty-ninth parliament will be as productive as the last session and of great benefit to all Canadians.

**Mr. Alexander:** It is up to you.

**Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin, as so many others have, by associating myself with the tributes which have been paid to His Excellency the Governor General, to his lady and also to the newly appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. Also, I should like to pay tribute to Your Honour. It is good to see you back again presiding over this new session with your usual calmness and impartiality. I enjoyed the address just concluded by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik). It was reasonably non-partisan though it contained a lot of self-applause in its early stages. We agree with much of what the hon. member said, and it is good to see he is changing his views.

On the basis of past experience, I think this Speech from the Throne can be fairly stated not to be a particularly credible document. It reads well, and if we could be certain that what is set out in the document would truly be implemented, we could talk about it in a much more meaningful way. It is interesting to note some of the remarks which are conspicuous in the speech both by their presence and by their absence.

● (1730)

There is no reference, even in an oblique way, to the famous just society which has been so prominently talked about in some past speeches made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I was so interested in the origin of the phrase "the just society" that I thought I would see where it came from. For the record, and if I am wrong I will stand corrected, I believe that those who are interested will find the origin of the phrase in the issue of the *New York Times* of Thursday, May 4, 1968. The phrase "the just society" should really be attributed to the great Czech