

*Suggested Lack of Urban Policy*

**Mr. Orlikow:** One would not call that a very radical organization. To my knowledge there are no more than half a dozen mayors who belong to the NDP in all the big cities of Canada, and that is probably more than there should be. So, when that organization makes a submission to the federal government it does not do so on the basis of politics but rather on the basis of the facts. Let me quote a couple of paragraphs on the problems as they see them. May I direct the attention of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) to this because he seems completely unaware of the view of the cities of this country.

**Mr. Allmand:** You know that Montreal does not belong to that organization.

**Mr. Orlikow:** The fact that Montreal does not belong to the organization is the result of its own decision and not that of anyone else. When they did belong, they went along with the views expressed in this submission, and I suggest to the hon. member that they would agree with this submission even though they do not belong. Here is what the organization says, and the hon. member can find it on page 4 of the submission if he wants to read it or if he can read, which I sometimes doubt:

It is imperative that, when three levels of government are involved, through a common concern, in community planning and community building—as in many cases they must be—they should reside, work together and negotiate under the same roof. This can only be done satisfactorily at the community level. Only at that level can the data-gathering, research, planning and debate be undertaken with due thoroughness. Only by such means can the Canadian people spare themselves the paralysing delays and the mental confusion that result from arm's-length or long range negotiations between three levels of government.

Among the problems with which they say—they say, not I—only the federal government can help are urban rapid transit, pollution and housing. With regard to the second, I suggest that no member of the House should be more interested in getting federal government co-operation to finance the solving of pollution problems than the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce in the light of the record of the city of Montreal.

It is about housing that I want to speak because the situation with regard to housing is getting worse rather than better. I do not know when there was a minister who had worse luck than the present Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) in charge of housing. They gave him the same job in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Develop-

[Mr. Alexander.]

ment, but when he developed good ideas which were not in agreement with those of the minister in charge he was pushed out. Now, they have given him the responsibility for housing at a time when the government's economic policies and social philosophy have led to a virtual cessation of the important task of rebuilding the housing stock in Canadian cities.

The Canadian Welfare Council's housing committee made a submission on the current housing situation in Canada in April of this year, a submission which ought to make the minister in charge of housing and every member of parliament hang their heads in shame". What the Welfare Council documents so clearly is that the situation is getting worse rather than better. They point out that the vacancy rates in cities such as Edmonton, Ottawa and Vancouver have dropped since 1968, that the only city in Canada considered to have anything approaching a reasonable vacancy rate is Montreal. I do not think the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce would be happy with that because he knows the reasons for it probably better than I do. The Welfare Council points out that the rate at which housing starts is going ahead for the first quarter of 1970, means that we will have an annual rate of only 160,000 housing starts, and this at a time when the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has estimated that we need 250,000 units a year. Housing starts are dropping at a disastrous rate. At the same time, the cost of housing has gone up to such an extent that the problem is no longer one simply for the people in the low income brackets or on welfare but for all the people.

I have in front of me a news report which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* issue of May 23, 1970. These statements could be true of any city in Canada. The headline is: "How the \$92.47 Chapel Glen Home Cost Grew to \$167.50 in 3 Years". I do not have time to even summarize this news story, but let me quote the last paragraph Mr. Suters, the representative of the Ontario Housing Corporation, said the following:

—since 1967 the average sale price of a house in metro has risen to \$42,805 from \$29,668. "This is the market we are working in," he said.

"In January 1967, 29.9 per cent of the new homes on the market were in the \$16,000 to \$22,000 price range, which we are still in," he said. "Today the figure is only 0.8 per cent."

• (4:50 p.m.)

So, Mr. Speaker, the result of the increase in the cost of land, and of the increase in