

Canada with the possibilities of wonderful achievements that will mark well our time and our wisdom.

The Honourable Robert Andras stated at the Indianapolis Conference:

The Ministry's role as a focus and source of policy development for urbanization in Canada will have three characteristic features:

(a) It will be co-ordinative in its method of developing comprehensive urban policies, based on continuing research, and primarily oriented to the federal presence and initiative.

(b) It will be supportive to the current and future urban programs maintained and developed by other federal agencies and having direct influence from coast to coast. In this process, the ministry will not attempt to duplicate existing delivery facilities, nor to take them over.

(c) It will be a consultative position in relation to the federal, provincial and municipal matters. The ministry is committed to developing a broadly and highly visible and continuing consultative forum and process involving the federal Government, the provinces and the municipalities and urban communities in order to build the broadest possible understanding for the process of urbanization and, thereby, initiating a consensus in the building of national policies and federal initiatives.

In some 30 years—just one generation—we are anticipating a Toronto with a population of 6.5 million, a Montreal with a population of 6.3 million, a Vancouver with a population of some 2½ million, and from six to ten other Canadian cities of over one million in population, each with an immensity of complex urban problems.

It makes a frightening and alarming urban picture in our minds, especially if we add the accompanying urban poverty. Yet, with adequate achieved and corrective planning, it can be accepted as a pleasurable, seductive and thrillingly beautiful picture. It is sad that in the past the best urban planners, the best urban dreamers, in Canada, as everywhere else, have very seldom brought about the realization of their dreams for us. We know with computerized certainty what is anticipated in the year 2000. I am glad we will not discard these new Canadian plans on urbanism. Such plans have the additional advantage of providing much needed employment. It remains true that when, as, and if, they are achieved and realized, they will then appear to posterity as the best real values that we, as individuals, left behind as cities, and as a country. They are what remain of note behind us; what there is to admire through time by the worlds of tomorrow, by Canadians of future generations.

The young, famed and renowned Vancouver architect, Arthur Erickson, the designer of the award-winning Expo 70 pavilion, the co-designer of Fraser University, and recent winner and recipient of the 1971 \$50,000 Royal Bank Canadian achievement award took the occasion of the acceptance of the award to attack the gridiron pattern of present urban designs which he said is geared to real estate and industry and not to the needs of the

people. He also took this occasion to attack the fragmented nature and isolationist philosophies of cities and their planning by saying:

If we are going to ask our cities to be worthwhile habitats for man, man has to have the priority. This has not been the case in North America.

The city, in its ugly, chaotic sprawl only reflects back our indifference to it—electric wires on wooden poles do visual violence to our views, as do wastelands of parked cars in the hearts of the cities, and deserted streets because the streets are not for people but grim sunless spaces between lowering edifices. Our priorities have not been for cities designed for man.

Much can be gained for Canadians by making every one of our citizens conscious of the studies and other Canadian reports on urbanism, and by projecting the image of what should be the design of our cities in the next decades. This seems to me to call for a major priority approach, and I make a strong plea for the implementation of their suggestions and recommendations.

On motion of Hon. Mr. McDonald, debate adjourned.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

PACIFIC AREA STUDY—PROGRESS REPORT OF COMMITTEE —DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate resumed from Wednesday, May 5, the adjourned debate on the inquiry of Hon. Mr. Aird calling the attention of the Senate to the recent activities of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs with regard to the Pacific area.

Hon. Paul Martin: Honourable senators, I was away from Canada for a few days at the end of June and at the beginning of July, the focal point of my mission being to represent the Government at the inauguration of the President of the Republic of Korea.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Leader of the Opposition, (Hon. Mr. Flynn), Senator McDonald and other honourable senators for the co-operative way which they allowed me to leave at that time, when there were some important measures before the Senate. I want them to know, the Leader of the Opposition in particular, how grateful I am for the co-operation extended to me in the last days of June.

I have again been fortunate in the coincidence of my responsibilities as a member of the cabinet with the responsibility with which the Senate has charged the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Last December I reported to the Senate on a government mission I had led to inquire into the state of our relations with Commonwealth Caribbean countries, a mission that took place after the publication of the study on the recommendation of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on that question. This session the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the chairmanship of Senator Aird, has undertaken a study of the Pacific; that is to say, our relations with the Pacific area. My mission to the Far East followed on the hear-