

Suggested Lack of Urban Policy

stalemate so much of our legislation. But time and again we run into problems about jurisdiction.

We should not really have to meet this problem because between the federal Parliament and the provincial legislatures there exists total legislative jurisdiction for the whole of Canada. All that is required is co-operation between the federal government and the provinces. This co-operation has been given many times in the past. When problems arose about jurisdiction, the federal Parliament and the provinces felt the need to get together to deal with them. Every jurisdiction in Canada is involved in the fight against pollution and in dealing with urban questions, but despite this division of power between the federal and provincial governments no action is taken to deal with the matter. Everybody wants action. Everyone is concerned about pollution. We have all the jurisdiction that is needed. Yet nothing is done. Perhaps I should not say nothing is done. I recognize that hon. gentlemen opposite are just as concerned as we are. But concern is not enough; action must be taken. In cases of divided jurisdiction I believe it is the federal government that must show leadership. No one province can or will take action because it does not feel that it can show leadership to the whole country.

● (8:50 p.m.)

We have seen, particularly in the last two years, I am sorry to say, the constitutional expert, the person who made much of having the constitution work for the benefit of Canada—that is, the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)—instead of using the constitution to develop the country, use it as an excuse for inaction in so many places. This is a real tragedy to my mind.

So many things should be done in the cities right now. The great problem is heavy traffic. There should be plans for rapid transit systems throughout the urban areas of Canada. Those plans should be developed here. We have the National Research Council, we have various departmental research units and many departments involved, so this is where it should be developed and published as a code, as should many of the ideas concerning pollution.

Rapid transit systems could accomplish two things. First, they could reduce the number of vehicles within the cities and thus reduce the pollution problem. Second, they could move traffic better and make life easier for those in

[Mr. Aiken.]

the cities by reducing sound and noise. So many things could be done. We should be working on the question of pollution-free engines for cars, lead-free gasolines for motor vehicles, sulphur-free fuels from oil and coal particularly. Car equipment is also very important as far as pollution is concerned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I am afraid his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Aiken: I have just one more thought, and I thank the House for giving me extra time. There are so many things that ought to be done and so many things that are under combined jurisdiction. The total problems of recycling our whole production are there and are important. Recycling is the key to most of the problems we have been talking about today, certainly in the city environment—recycling industrial effort, recycling water, recycling effluent—so that this planet would be like the satellites which went around the earth and subsequently to the moon and back containing within themselves the ability to recycle and continue to live on a permanent basis. Surely if we can do that on the way to outer space, the same development could take place on the planet earth which has also been described as the space ship earth.

If we in this country made the effort to combine federal and provincial jurisdiction and said, "We will do this in the federal field if you will do that in the provincial field," I think we could find the answers and in time make a better life for the next generation.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, like many other members in the House I welcome this motion which gives us an opportunity to debate urban affairs. I confess, however, that I was very disappointed, after listening to the speeches from the group that proposed this motion, at what they had to say. I looked for some new ideas, I looked for a little imagination and I looked for something a little different. The members of that group remind me of the Irishman who allegedly got on his horse and galloped off madly in all directions. One of the directions they want to go is housing, another is transportation. The horse they want to move is a department of urban affairs. Somehow this is to be a department that does not need any more federal money: it just has to co-ordinate