

Supply—Labour

resources are limited, and in these circumstances it is only natural and human that municipal officials will encourage the construction of revenue-producing office buildings and industrial plants rather than public housing projects. Surely it is entirely clear that if the municipalities are to welcome public housing projects these projects must be made financially attractive to the municipalities. This is a financial, not a constitutional, problem and it can be solved.

Out of date municipal building restrictions and expropriation laws also impede public housing. Finally, the additional time and expense involved in dealing with a multitude of authorities at three different governmental levels impose a heavy and often impossible burden of expense, delay and frustration upon all those concerned with public housing.

No doubt these problems can be resolved in a number of ways. However, any solution does involve more direct federal participation in public housing and therefore a new federal initiative in this field. For example, in each large urban municipality where a serious public housing problem exists there could be formed under provincial charter a public housing corporation governed by a small and competent board of directors consisting of persons nominated by the municipality and the provincial and federal governments. I hope these persons would not be civil servants. Our civil service bureaucracy is already too large.

The necessary money would be provided by the federal and provincial governments in the agreed ratios. The corporation would have the power to expropriate on fair terms, power to cut through unreasonable municipal building restrictions, to acquire and service raw land and to buy or build public housing.

Admittedly there is need now for economy in government, but this plan would not involve expenditures above those now contemplated. Some of the money previously used to finance expensive single family homes would be diverted to meet the needs of those people whose needs are greatest and most urgent. The construction industry can be as well employed in building public housing as in building single family dwellings at \$20,000 or more, luxury apartments or large office buildings. I believe it is entirely clear that there is no constitutional objection to such a scheme.

I think all of us in the house would agree that public housing is now an urgent necessity. I think we would also agree that it is

[Mr. Wahn.]

not the best ultimate solution. All of us, I am sure, look forward to the day when every healthy Canadian can earn enough money by his own efforts to provide decent housing for himself and his family so that public housing will be required only by the elderly, the sick and the disabled. In the meantime, however, we do have a public housing crisis in some of our large cities. I hope that members of all parties will support additional federal action in this field.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Before calling on the next speaker it is my duty, pursuant to standing order 39A, to announce the adjournment proceedings for ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire): The Estates General of Quebec and French Canada.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale—National Parks, possible retention of tourist cabins.

The hon. member for Kootenay West—Power, Columbia river, alleged delay in federal payments to British Columbia.

Mr. Graftey: Mr. Chairman, before I make my brief remarks this evening I should like to give my views relating to partisanship. I think partisanship is at its worst when we deal with personalities in the House of Commons in the wrong way. It seems to me there is a new type of partisanship coming from the government this afternoon.

What has been happening, Mr. Chairman? We have been telling the government for three years that there is a housing shortage in Canada and that the government is doing nothing about it. All members who returned to their constituencies this summer discovered there was a housing crisis, not a shortage. We have been putting on *Hansard* day in and day out for the last three years positive suggestions in the matter of housing. But what has happened? The government and its supporters come to the House of Commons at the resumption of this session in the fall of 1967 and say: "Oh, don't be partisan; don't criticize us."

I suggest that that is exactly the role of an opposition, and we are going to continue to put forward positive suggestions on the floor of this house. We are also going to continue to point out to the people of Canada that this government has no policy and is giving no national leadership in the field of housing. I