

*Housing*

corridor running 4,000 miles from Newfoundland via Labrador City, Rouyn-Noranda, Lake Winnipeg, Thompson and diverging off from there into three great areas of Canada that have not yet been touched, the first the Mackenzie River out to the Arctic Ocean, the second down the Yukon River to the Dawson area, and the third by way of the Peace River all the way through to Prince Rupert? Why can we not do this as a means of establishing a pattern of smaller related urban centres for the next century of growth?

In the Acres study, which developed Rohmer's theme, it was suggested that Canada consider creating cities of up to half a million population in areas such as Whitehorse, Hay River, Thompson, Flin Flon, the Lakehead, Noranda and Labrador City. While these may as yet be beyond our sights, would not the creation of a series of expanded towns between the existing limits of major urbanization and such frontier areas greatly speed up the process?

In the case of the largest urban centres can we not advantageously explode the new growth into the creation of a related and interacting set of cities each with a special pattern of appropriate functions, with a definite form? There are strong trends towards decentralization, and by working with them and moving imaginatively into large scale regional planning and open space reservations we might well achieve a higher level of economic activity and by God we sure as hell, would achieve a better living standard.

Do we not need a wholesale restructuring at all levels of our national governmental units? Can we not devise a form of region which involves a common set of large regions, in which there is a definite strategic plan, and permanently flexible contingency planning with federal and provincial levels in a contractual relationship carrying out these plans; and a set of urban areas with local government to do the urban planning within that regional context?

Should not each region move swiftly to safeguard the space for both the environmental areas and the transportation corridors? We know that land costs have a drastic effect on transportation solutions. If we do not wish to reserve the actual space are we not compelled then in some way to bring the force of our legislative power, counsel and wisdom to the controlling of land costs so that these problems can be met at a later date?

Since our economic capacities will be strained to cope with the massive growth that

[Mr. Forrestall.]

faces us, do we not need some new policies? Why we do we hide behind the cloak of constitutional arguments? I suggest that some of these policies might include very strong regional planning, with the power to control the intensity of land use in relation to transport capacities; a greater, perhaps even lavish use of green belt regulations to give stable units of urbanization a chance as functioning entities in the regional urban pattern; strong powers of industrial and office and commercial location so that these generators go where new towns and new satellites can be built around them; diversion of growth from areas which are considered relatively stable and "in balance" to "expanding" areas; new powers jointly exercised by the federal-provincial governments or by new regional forms of government to guide growth.

We need road protection and road pricing policies to introduce the concept of profitability into urban planning.

We need computer controlled regional networks where the right of entry and egress can be controlled in accordance with need.

We need a new approach to planning which seeks to create stable environmental units with the longest possible life, but with multiple use development to minimize external traffic generation and internal movements. We need staggered working hours, and even a slower pace of life, and that in much more compatible surroundings than what we are facing.

• (7:30 p.m.)

Can we not totally exclude the through vehicle and the mixed traffic from the centre of our cities, and make them pedestrian havens with servicing by vehicles to controlled points and at controlled hours? Should we forget about the traditional suburb and create instant cities or cities in the suburbs; or should we recognize the "scatteration" concept and instead simply accelerate the sprawl which is now occurring, trusting to the market forces to create a good environment? Does not the challenge confronting us require a much more effective technique of enforcement and development control than we now have? Even if we are to develop the regional strategies needed, do we not need a form of permanent contingency planning to cope with change? Even if we do not wish to concern ourselves unduly about the form and pattern of urbanization, have we any likelihood of avoiding massive slum conditions, severe