

Urban Transportation

was almost foisted upon the people. Had it not been for the reaction of the people concerned in the city of Toronto and elsewhere, an immense project might have been undertaken on the wrong premises, and without proper pre-examination. Certain officials took one aspect of it. The location was selected by provincial authorities and so far as we know the municipal authorities were not consulted at all and if they were, they decided that they did not want the project. Although my constituents would be served by the airport in the east end of Toronto, they do not want this project to proceed.

If we had a national transportation authority, as is proposed by this bill, the elected representatives of the people would be in a position to object to such projects. One of the reasons against this project is not only doubt whether the need has been adequately demonstrated but is the indirect results of this project in this neighbourhood. How many houses in the riding of Greenwood would have to be torn down in order to provide transportation to the airport? That matter should be discussed and the local representatives should be given the opportunity to take part before the project is approved.

A national transportation authority could do all sorts of other things. It could pressure for greater development of new technologies in the field of transportation. One of the dangers of the present rate of progress is that we get a new scheme and by the time it is put into practice it has become obsolete. There are all sorts of novel developments, but I disclaim being an expert on the subject so I hope no one will ask me what those developments are. However, I have seen and read a good deal about all sorts of new forms of transportation which are essential to the solution of these problems and which could save millions of dollars but which become obsolete before they become operative.

In the draft bill there is a provision which is not acceptable, however, but it could be dealt with when the House comes to second reading, which I suppose is *prima facie* rather than probable. Clause 3, "Objects and Powers" should be looked at very carefully. Clause 3(c) provides for federal, provincial, regional and municipal representation to be established by the board itself. I do not think that any federal parliament has the right to establish regional, provincial and municipal representation. What it has is the right to create an authority, with which, by either co-operation or delegation of powers, these local and provincial bodies can participate. I think that is the main purpose of the bill and I support it. Although second reading of the bill is dubious, I think the hon. member deserves the thanks of this House for bringing forward a subject which is of immense importance to a large number of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, as a newcomer in this House, I think I was asked to take the floor on Bill C-26 and that is what I am going to do. I noticed that two hon. members tackled the matter of an airport and I think that Bill C-26, as it has been drafted, does not apply only to the building of a national airport like the airport of Pickering. Thus, it is with considerable interest that I take part in this debate because it is a

[Mr. Brewin.]

subject which, I think, all hon. members as well as my constituents are interested in.

Bill C-26, introduced by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), deals with the question of urban transportation in metropolitan areas and elsewhere, but in Ottawa-Hull, it is a topic all residents of both provinces are interested in.

[*English*]

When I read the bill, Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the hon. member for York Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) was not proposing to undo the momentum already attained in solving urban transportation problems whereby the government engages in patient, careful negotiations in the most intelligent way possible, to arrive at long lasting solutions. What I am getting at, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member for York Simcoe has left out of this proposed legislation a fact which is very important and that is the inter-relatedness of things municipal and urban. Everyone of the social problems of our urban centres has to be regarded and understood and the inter-relatedness of all those social problems, be they technological or otherwise, are affected by all other problems such as housing, etc. We are not so ingenious that we can allow ourselves to review problems in such a vacuum as proposed in Bill C-26.

Legislative programs and agencies must be seen in context. My hon. friend's bill does not take account of this very important factor of the inter-relatedness of urban issues. He has failed to grasp what I would call the obvious. Urban transportation, urban housing, urban neighbourhood, urban services cannot be treated in isolation. He might be talking about Pickering and the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), who has more experience than we two combined, repeated some of the arguments regarding the airport but I think the bill in question could have been the object of some more constructive comments in its defence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa East): We have enough, not to say a lot of municipal, regional, provincial and federal agencies and I think there are enough structures in Canada to deal with all the problems we can imagine, especially as regards urban transportation.

We have—and this is what the government is trying to do—to solve our problems by the adopting innovative measures through government agencies open to wide consultation with provinces and municipalities in order to find long term solutions to the numerous social problems generated by modern communities.

● (1730)

[*English*]

I am not an expert on transportation, but from reading Bill C-26 I realize that it ignores the realities of transportation in Canada. One cannot deal with transportation in urban areas as something distinct and set apart from transportation between urban areas. I am thinking particularly of the Ottawa area. It would be nonsense and folly if Ontario, for example, and the Ottawa regional council established one system of urban transportation,