

and in France. I could cite many other countries that have a central authority determining what type of facilities are needed or should be put into a local area.

My bill is designed to give the authority to an overriding national authority which, in turn, can delegate its authority to these regional levels, similar to what they have in New York where there is the Port of New York Authority, similar to what they have in southern California where there is the Southern California Association of Counties, and similar to the Chicago situation where there is actually a department of the city of Chicago running the local airports. But I would stress, for the attention of the hon. member for York North (Mr. Danson), that the federal government of the United States has consistently refused to give federal assistance to the type of airport development which his minister is contemplating at Toronto International No. 2. The developments through these authorities are handled with local financing.

For example, a comparable development to the one being proposed at Pickering is in Dallas-Fort Worth, to which I have already referred. The money for that project is being raised through a revenue bond issue of some \$400 million. That bond issue is guaranteed 100 per cent, jointly and severally, by the air carriers that will use that airport. The total cost anticipated for the development will be \$700 million. I emphasize that that is a smaller development than the proposed one at Pickering, but the initial cost will be \$700 million, and eventually \$1 billion. However, I would emphasize that the local authorities throughout the United States, in all of the areas I have referred to, have no airports of the nature of Pickering and Mirabel in the planning or development stage at the present time, in spite of the fact that their projected needs could well be three, four, and in some cases five times the projected needs for any future airport facilities in Montreal or Toronto.

I would also mention that this national authority, if established, would give the people in the local regions what they want. For example, in my own area of Toronto for many years we have attempted to have better transportation facilities, of a commuter transit nature, than presently exist. We have been constantly told by the federal authorities that they have no funds, and they have in fact brought very little effective action to bear on this subject until now. Up until a few months ago, they relied on the fact that they were waiting on a Toronto commuter rail study which they had commissioned, jointly with other bodies, to be undertaken by Dr. Soberman. Mr. Speaker, now they have had that study in their hands since November of last year. That study indicates that a fully developed commuter service, on lines which Dr. Soberman considers desirable, would cost between \$80 million and \$130 million, and would carry 11,789,500 people a year. I am simply pointing out that, according to the federal government, there is no money available for the development of a service that would help the man going to work on a daily basis, that would help the relatively poor person in our area, but on the other hand it can find money for the development of airports, which are essentially for the rich, to the tune of half a billion dollars or \$1 billion per airport. Under a national urban transportation authority, I would hope that there would be a better reflection through the regional authorities of the true needs in each of the regions.

Urban Transportation

Dealing with need, Mr. Speaker, we have a Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who, from time to time, takes a trip through our area. When asked about the airport, he indicated that if the majority of the people were opposed to it, then of course he would not go ahead with the airport. Public opinion polls have reflected that the majority are opposed to it, but I would suggest that because of the centralized federal approach to this project there is no way that the public opinion in my area will be felt in a decisive decision-making way. However, if there were a local authority, and if that local authority first had the responsibility of financing the project and, secondly, for making sure that the project was a worthwhile development for the area, I am confident you would not have the rather autocratic approach that has been taken to date by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) and by the present government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. Before I recognize the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) I would like to note with respect to Bill C-26, which the hon. member for York-Simcoe has presented to the House, and to the point of order that was raised by the hon. member for York North, that the impression might be left by the speech given by the sponsor that this was a debate more on the Pickering airport than on the bill itself.

When hon. members present bills, in all fairness to all hon. members, they should debate the basic principles of the bills. Therefore, if other hon. members do not address themselves to the contents of this particular bill, and I have to call them to order, I hope the House will understand and excuse me.

● (1720)

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I had not anticipated entering this debate but as I entered the House and heard the subject matter, I thought I should like to say a few words, although I confess I seldom enter debates on the subject of transportation for the very odd reason that I do not know very much about it.

Mr. Stanbury: That does not stop anybody else.

Mr. Brewin: It does not stop too many people. I should like, in general, to support the principle set out in the bill introduced by the hon. member for York Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). The subject of urban transportation is of great importance to all those who represent urban areas. As the bill suggests, the situation is not satisfactory. There is a clear lack of co-ordination between the provinces, the municipalities and the federal authorities, all of whom are concerned in the effective working out of the very serious problems of transportation which not only affect the environment but the whole economy and the lives of many of our people.

I agree with the hon. member that one of the best illustrations of this is in the metropolitan area of Toronto, and that is the history of the so-called Pickering airport. It is a good example of what should not be done. Had the urban transportation authority which he proposes or some similar machine been in existence, we might never have had the difficulties that have been experienced with this proposal. There, without any adequate inquiry, a tremendously expensive and tremendously dubious proposition