

over monetary and fiscal policy, which is, in fact, decisive for housing and urban development.

Moreover, the patterns of urban growth are nation-wide and are simply beyond provincial power to control. The upshot of this has been a myriad of confusion and *ad hoc* arrangements which seldom take the long view.

We will surely not see for our great urban centres the vast realizations that were and are now being dreamed of by our urbanists and that were or are recommended unless we find effective ways of providing and assuring the right actions on these recommendations.

Presently we are far from using ideal Canadian guidelines in the field of urbanism, for fighting our urban poverty, for instance, and the placing of urbanist reports to be dealt with on the Greek calends, as the saying goes, alongside so many other forgotten worthwhile recommendations for the betterment of our equitable Canadian urban living. This makes us rather wonder about the possibility of our establishing comprehensive, large-scale Canadian strategic urban plans.

[Translation]

In town planning, one must be objective and admit that it is useless to try and achieve impossible dreams or absurdities which would but establish meaningless differences in style, very controversial concepts, doomed from the start to failure, to general criticism, such as was the case in 1967, with Habitat at Man and His World, where no account was taken of the extremes of our Canadian climate, or the comfort of the tenants, so as to enjoy more freedom in the outline of an external architectural innovation, purist and personal, but simplistic and devoid of any functional concept.

Let me take this opportunity to mention that it is also, nowadays, surprising to note in this country the obsolescence and confusion of our Canadian standards for building and town planning in all classes of society.

The majority of these appear debatable and, in too many cases, backward, obsolete, while forcing and imposing too often very ugly realizations, neither functional nor practical, and even condemnable.

Also, there is no good reason why building standards should vary, as they do now, from one province to the other, according to tastes and wishes sometimes quite peculiar and which, too often, are essentially different according to the region, city or town.

Such absurd and unnecessary differences between Canadian standards should not exist in a country where the best data and the best methods of technical assessment are available.

I, for one, am most anxious to see the recommendations and suggestions embodied in the Lithwick report implemented in the best interests of a great number of Canadians.

[English]

Bill C-207, enacted last June, established Canada's first Minister of State for Urban Affairs who assumed the responsibility of creating a new institution to cope with the mounting issues of a rapidly urbanizing Canada. The

[Hon. Mr. Desruisseaux.]

new Ministry of Urban Affairs is being committed by its minister, the Honourable Robert Andras, to some important and far-reaching objectives.

Mr. Andras, in a speech delivered at a conference on cities in Indianapolis in May of this year, said:

For many of our societies abound with great designs for achieving political or administrative reforms and although the will and expertise to develop the broad policy frameworks which our complex economies and societies demand is a difficult enough process, the real test comes in seeking their implementation. The complex formal organizations, the public bureaucracies, and private institutions, as well as the fragmentation among political jurisdictions, all work to prevent changes in our traditional ways of coping with national problems, I believe the new approach to our urban planning offers our Canadians some hope that we shall now see the planned realization of useful political, social and economic recommendations on the state of our Canadian urbanization, on the possibilities of added modernized guidelines and on the help to be accorded to our Canadians toward the achievement and the realization of a Canadian urban dream, basically supported by practical, esthetical, functional and economical considerations.

We have seen its equivalent in the better periods of antiquity in Egypt. We have seen it at the time of the Romans and the Greeks, and we have seen it closer to our times in the urban horizontal architectural planning and achievements in Paris, Rome, Vienna, Buenos Aires and a few other great and beautiful cities of our world that are now, we must admit, unfortunately being gradually destroyed or damaged because of necessary *ad hoc* modern traffic arrangements.

In spite of this, Grecian, Italian, Egyptian and these other beautiful cities remain focal points of things to see because of their urban visionaries. Here the solution to new basic urban problems now calls for the installation of modern urban expressways, of more numerous and diversified urban airports in ever-increasing numbers, of urban business centres of a conception and on a scale never before imagined, of functional skyscrapers for all imaginable purposes, and of immense urban underground complexes of stores, garages, theatres, subways and crossway passages. Why should we view on our streets, for instance, quite continuously an accumulation of garbage bags and cans waiting, sometimes for days, to be carried away? Why should man be without shading trees on most streets? Why should traffic be what it is? Exhaustive and daring urban studies of these problems have been made with a view to more appropriate and corrective legislative guidelines. While it is now important to open the minds of all our Canadians to newer and bolder creative, aesthetical, functional Canadian approaches to all aspects of the urban problems, it must be fully realized that urban poverty is closely connected to the urbanization process.

Our generation will now be provided with better means through this new ministry so that it can furnish