

### Urban Transportation

for dealing generally with airport development and expansion. That fund runs up into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and an hon. member made the comment:

It is a very handy kind of fund, is it not?

Whereupon the Minister of Transport stated:

Oh, yes, especially at election time.

I feel that perhaps jokingly the minister conveyed a great deal in those two comments that I have quoted. While I introduced this bill for consideration some time ago, I believe that it is more imperative today than ever that we stop the centralized control of urban transportation with respect to railways, air traffic, and also the handling of our water passenger service as that related to our urban harbours.

Let me first lay down a few facts on this subject. Here we have the Minister of Transport stating that there is a serious possibility that an airport in the Toronto area, a new airport, will be needed by 1980. In a form tabled on April 26, 1972, the department put in a schedule listing what they proposed to do and the number of passengers in the various airports of our main North American cities. I believe that hon. members should note that if one follows that schedule and checks out what they project for the year 1980, one finds that Toronto is No. 9 in the expectation of passengers and Montreal is No. 10. The projection is that, for example, the number of passengers passing through Toronto in 1980 will be 15.5 million and through Montreal in the same year there will be 12 million. This compares with the fact that New York in the same year is projected to have 89.1 million passengers, the No. 1 city on the continent; Chicago, the No. 2 city, is projected to have 68 million passengers, and Los Angeles, the No. 3 city, is projected to have 48.9 million passengers.

I believe that in considering the bill I am proposing we should take a serious look at the irresponsible approach of the present Minister of Transport. The fact is that, in spite of the fact that Toronto and Montreal are rated in their own schedule as being ninth and tenth so far as traffic projections are concerned for the year 1980, those two cities are the only cities in North America that are contemplating or developing an airport of the magnitude of Pickering or Mirabel. Surely, it is time that we asked ourselves: why does New York decide after due deliberation that they do not need an additional airport? Why does Chicago decide that they do not need an additional airport, and why does Los Angeles decide in the same way?

To bring this into perspective, I believe it is time that the government started to be more candid with the people of Canada. For example, the John F. Kennedy international airport with 4,900 acres of land, approximately 100 acres smaller than the present Malton airport in Toronto, is handling approximately double the traffic that is projected for the entire Toronto area in 1980 today. To give you another example, this morning I spoke to the commissioner for aviation for the city of Chicago and I asked him what their plans were for future airport development in that city. The commissioner laughed and said: "We have no plans". I said: "Is it not true that in Dallas and Fort Worth they are planning an airport of some 17,000 acres?" He said: "The Texans like to do things big. They've got the money, more power to them, but in our case we cannot, from the capital standpoint, afford such luxury. And

[Mr. Stevens.]

besides that, we do not need it". I asked the commissioner what in 1972 and 1973 would be the likely passenger traffic at O'Hare airport, for example. He informed me that for 1972 it was 34 million passengers and for 1973 it will be 37 million passengers.

I checked with the Canadian authorities regarding the actual amount of traffic through Toronto and Montreal, and I found that the comparable figures were seven million passengers for Toronto and between four million and five million passengers for Montreal. Here we have a situation where the commissioner of the biggest airport on the continent, or as they claim in the world feels, that there is no need for new facilities until 1990 or the year 2,000 and there may not ever be the need for such new facilities. I would suggest that one of the reasons we have got ourselves into this position of contemplating a half billion dollar airport in the Toronto area and a half billion dollar airport at Mirabel in Quebec is that we have a civil service that is out of control. The civil servants have decided, not the people of Toronto and not the people of Montreal, that both of those centres need an airport, that they will have an airport, and that their brainchild will be constructed.

• (1710)

I suggest that if we had local authorities dealing with this matter we would not get such irresponsible actions. I suggest also that one of the political reasons an airport of the magnitude of Pickering is being contemplated is that it was first decided that there should be an airport of this size in Mirabel, and then—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order. Is the hon. member for York North rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Danson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was given to understand that we were discussing Bill C-26, an act to establish a national urban transportation authority, and I was very much looking forward to speaking on that bill. Has there been a mistake? The hon. member is not referring to that bill at all? He is talking about an airport.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order. I must say that the point of order is well taken. Of course, in private members' hour we are not as firm as at other times, but if we really check Bill C-26 there is no doubt that part of the hon. member's explanation has taken us some distance away from the basics of the bill. Perhaps he would return to the bill in order to keep in order.

**Mr. Stevens:** Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if I have conveyed that impression, because the point I am making is that we do not have local regional authorities dealing with the questions that I have been discussing. I believe that the question of an airport in Toronto would be decided differently if we had a regional authority dealing with air traffic, with rail transportation of an urban nature, with the harbours in Toronto, and likewise if we had a regional authority dealing with those subjects in Montreal. I have chosen to refer to the situation in the United States because the fact is that all such developments in the United States are handled at the city or local authority level. This situation is peculiar to Canada, and is not typical of the development of similar facilities in England