

*Urban Affairs*

Mr. Speaker, to my mind, if the inhabitants of the riding of Brome-Missisquoi cannot afford a home on an annual income of \$5,000, \$6,000 or \$7,000, the hon. member is not doing his job. He should prove to us that the present legislation does not allow low-income workers to purchase a home.

Mr. Speaker, if one studied in depth the proposals of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, if one went to the trouble of reading his statement, one would realize that he is really aware of the situation, for he wants investments of \$100 million to be made over a fairly long period of time. He is aware that practical problems must be solved and that it is not a matter of studies, far from it. He is also aware that decisions must be made on the type of projects that will be accepted.

First, the projects under consideration will have to be geared to the solution of definite problems, contrarily—he said it openly—to those which do nothing more than determining, defining or analyzing them. They are not studies but practical applications, Mr. Speaker.

Second, a project must be applicable to most of Canada. Such quality will be judged in terms of the degree to which the project principles may be applied to other areas of the country. The minister is fully aware—he is as smart as anybody else and he knows his country—that there are different regions in Canada. And that is also written. I think that people did not bother to read it.

Third, a project must innovate and steer away from traditional practices. Now who is able to warn us about dangers which will crop up in 5 or 10 years from now as a result of today's building methods? Few hon. members here can do so.

The investment that this government intends to make is one that will permit practical research. There is a difference between carrying on research on paper and implementing it immediately. I suggest that this is the most important point that should be examined.

And they say that every demonstration project will have to meet at least one secondary criterion. Certain projects must show evidence of co-ordination and co-operation between two or more government levels. I suggest that the minister is already aware that the phenomenon of urbanization on the south shore of Montreal which I represent, as in Toronto or Vancouver, has taken a few municipal administrations by surprise. Toronto has banned the construction of highrises but elsewhere they try to advocate it.

Mr. Speaker, if need be the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Basford) should impose restrictive measures so that in 5, 10 or 15 years, we do not repeat the mistakes that were made before 1961, when the middle class was building dormitory towns, when it was impossible for a workman to buy a house. Before 1961, all the necessary components of a policy had not been put together in order to really enable people, large families who really need a shelter, to buy a house.

Today, thanks to the steps that were taken since 1968, more and more people can afford to buy a house. If we read the non-confidence motion that was put forward today, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are far from taking into consideration the people who need a house. On the

[Mr. Olivier.]

contrary, more attention is being given to the desire for power, they try to take all kinds of means to that end at the expense of the people who cannot afford to buy a house.

When we try, through coercive measures, to provide people with necessary tools, a non-confidence motion is being put forward, while we are spending \$100 million in an attempt to facilitate the purchase of homes and to find a solution to urban problems. Again I say they are not necessarily construction problems, but rather social problems. Many factors are involved. Today, cities are being built along the shore of the St. Lawrence River. It is a shame but all the sewers are flowing into the river. This is what is happening. In view of the project announced and of the optimism demonstrated by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, I think that in Canada, in Quebec, in Longueuil, we will succeed in enabling all those who really want a house to buy one even though they earn \$4,000, \$5,000 or \$6,000.

We should once and for all be logical. I hear millionaires speaking of poverty, I hear filthy rich people in Parliament speak about a poverty they have never experienced. They have never known poverty and they are labouring the point at the people's expenses. But, on the contrary, they should try to settle real problems. Let us set aside partisan issues. If they try to obtain power at the workers' expenses, as tonight, Mr. Speaker, I say it is disgusting.

[*English*]

**Mr. Elias Nesdoly (Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the debate this afternoon with a great deal of interest. I found certain phases of it very amusing. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) based his speech fundamentally on our ideas, and when he could not copy from us he used empty rhetoric. He did not tell us what he believed in.

The previous speaker talked about getting away from conventionality, or something like that. Mr. Speaker, why do we need to get away from the conventional? We have a lot of ideas about building and we should continue to pursue those ideas. We certainly do not need to import ideas about building from other nations whose climate is quite different from ours.

A few days ago the minister announced an innovative housing program. I think the \$100 million involved is merely a sop, but I do not think—neither do my colleagues—that it is a matter upon which to call an election

**An hon. Member:** What is?

**Mr. Nesdoly:** When the time comes, gentlemen, you will know. Yesterday's motion dealt with urban needs. Today's motion deals with the same topic. What bothers me as a member from a fairly far-flung riding is that the Liberal and the Tory parties are not too concerned about rural and small town needs. About 30 per cent of Canadians do not live near huge urban areas. I should like to give some statistical information on that point later.

● (2040)

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk about repealing the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. I would endorse such a move if I could be sure that the savings