

*Housing*

**Mr. Mackasey:** I have used that tactic, too, and I recognize it.

**Mr. Lewis:** I learnt it from the hon. gentleman. Will he not agree he might be doing a great service to the government, and to this parliament, if he were to refer to the subject of this debate instead of making rather cheap electoral asides?

● (7:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, I am not guilty of cheap electoral asides as the arrogant member has suggested. I did refer to remarks made by members of the New Democratic party and their cheap tactics used during the last election campaign; not my tactics, theirs. These tactics were reported in the *Globe and Mail* for May 22, 1968, as follows:

We have to give to the central government the necessary constitutional authority to do the things that need to be done. We are trying to make do with a horse and buggy in a jet age.

The leader of the New Democratic party said;

We cannot abrogate our constitutional commitments to Quebec. It may mean that in any area such as education and housing, where Quebec feels that a strong federal power may erode provincial rights, it may be necessary to have two programs—one for English speaking Canada and one for Quebec.

As a Quebecker, I say that is separatism in disguise. It is a special status no matter how you look at it. It is nothing more than a weakening of the federal government. If you want to say to the province of Quebec, you take housing, and the other nine provinces will cede their rights to the federal government respecting housing.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Can I ask the minister a question?

**Mr. Mackasey:** You have already asked enough questions.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I have not asked any. Could I ask the minister if by having two pension plans, which he supported as a member of the Liberal government, he feels that separatism had been introduced in Canada?

**Mr. Mackasey:** I would have felt a lot better with one pension plan. I voted for it because it was the only way. If you want to extend that principle to every area of the constitution of Quebec, whether you like it or not in 18 months you are going to have two countries. You may want that, I don't.

I have been talking about Quebec, but we must not lose sight of the fact the other provinces are equally jealous of their rights under the constitution. The strongest paper submitted to the task force in the field of housing did not come from the province of Quebec, but from the good Tory government of Ontario.

**Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate to point out the ridiculous position taken by the Prime Minister in implying there is no crisis in this country. If there was no indication of a housing crisis, why did he appoint the task force on housing as one of the first acts of his administration? Was it merely an effort to keep his deputy out of his way so he would not be reminded of some of the urgent and practical problems facing the people of this country? Was it to reward some of his important supporters in the last election?

I wish to point out some of the practical problems facing two municipalities in my constituency. The city of Calgary faces the problem of trying to house some 2,000 people which arrive at its gates every month. It has been active in the field of urban renewal and public housing for approximately five years. Both of these projects have been established as a result of action taken by previous federal administrations in recognition of a problem that has been present in this country since the end of the second world war. These programs have not had the best results because of some of the actions of recent federal administrations which have been referred to by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). He just concluded some colourful and interesting remarks, which were not entirely to the point, but he did say that one of the basic problems is that of red tape in the administration. The problems of Calgary are clearcut examples of the red tape which this administration is incapable of cutting through. This is an admission of failure to solve the problems of housing which we face today.

Some policies of this government create housing problems which are not related to the constitutional problems faced by this nation. Housing units are being built in an attempt to solve the problems, but these people cannot afford to live in these units. High rise apartments have high rents. Why are these being built instead of units which will satisfy the needs of the people? The reasons relate to problems under government control, such as taxation and fiscal policies of the government.