

Urban Affairs

the NDP, the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party would have to say what I am about to say. We have voted millions and millions of dollars on the floor of this House of Commons, and before any of these moneys are voted into the rural areas they are eaten up in the large urban areas. It is only right that the urban areas in our kind of country should have in many ways a prior claim, but not such a claim that people living in a rural atmosphere have no claim on the treasury when it comes to obtaining loans from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Today in this House the minister spoke of the assisted home ownership program. I do not want to knock it, but it has been going on for a long time now and I note that not too many Canadians in the lower income brackets have applied for it or could meet the criteria, for the fact is, vis-à-vis the home ownership program, that once all calculations are made we are told that the cost of a house under the program cannot surpass \$26,000. With the notable exception of the greater metropolitan area of Montreal, in no major urban area can one buy a house on a decent lot for \$26,000. No matter who one speaks to, whether on this side of the House or the other, or officials involved in housing, we know that by the end of this century the demand for housing will have doubled.

What is even worse is that the average price of houses sold in Canadian cities in 1973 had increased by 20 per cent in relation to the price in 1972. What is another fact that we must look into vis-à-vis home ownership in Canada today? Generally speaking, from coast to coast, in order even to begin to contemplate buying his own home a person must have an income of \$17,000 a year. What does this say about the humanitarian approach of the government in respect of supplying decent housing for the great mass of Canadians? We have said time and again that decent housing and shelter for all people is a priority social and economic item.

Mr. Basford: Do you have a program?

Mr. Grafftey: If you would take the trouble to read our program precisely and completely, you would see that it is a positive program.

Mr. Basford: The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has not even read the program.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted to me I do not wish to give a litany of the problems. However, any member of parliament merely has to go back to his riding to find out that apart from inflation and maladministration of the unemployment insurance fund, housing is a basic, gut issue on the lips of every Canadian. What is the answer from this government and this minister? Another \$100 million study. If there is anything this government and preceding Liberal governments have done, it is to give us a litany or a dictionary of what I might call delay procedures in the form of studies in general instead of action.

Mr. Corbin: You are killing time.

Mr. Grafftey: If I seem to be killing time, I know how frustrating this is to Liberal backbenchers. They see the writing on the wall. What have we had vis-à-vis housing

[Mr. Grafftey.]

from this government? We have had royal commissions and federal-provincial conferences. Under one, Mr. Nicholson, we had a housing symposium. We have had parliamentary inquiries, green papers, white papers and task forces. We had the Pestalozzi College experiment and the Rochdale experiment.

Let us look at a short list, under this government and the present minister, of studies we have actually had—studies, not action. I notice that members on the backbenches look a little unhappy because I am sure their constituents have spoken to them about the housing problem. We have had a study on housing in Canada, market structure and policy performance 1971. We have had a task force on housing and urban development, January, 1969, another study. Then there have been the new National Housing Act programs, 1971, and the federal-provincial conference on housing.

This is an esoteric one, Future Process of Policy and Program Development under the present minister. We have had an annual conference on housing and urban development. We have had the mid-Canada development conference. We have had the Canadian housing statistics, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and we have had the Central Mortgage and Housing annual report, as well as projections for the future. We had all these studies before the present one involving \$100 million. Then there is the special \$200 million, low cost housing program study. We have had a site planning study for mobile homes. We have had a review of the rent to income scale for public housing units. We have had a study on housing and people by the Canadian Council on Social Development. Then there was the Architecture Canada study. We also had an inquiry into where the \$200 million went, by the Canadian Council on Social Development.

Back in 1968 I had the honour to represent the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) on the federal task force looking into housing and urban affairs.

Mr. Basford: Who led that?

Mr. Grafftey: The very honourable and progressive minister of the time. If the government had paid attention to that report and to the minister at the time, it would have been far better off, believe me.

Mr. Basford: What did you say about it at that time?

Mr. Grafftey: If the minister would read the reports he would learn what I said about it. In a non-partisan way I said it was an excellent report. But the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), aided and abetted by the now Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), said there was no housing crisis in Canada. I doubt that the Prime Minister had visited very many low income people from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

● (2020)

Let me return to my thesis. During the task force study from city to city we heard about modular housing, about new methods of building and about condominiums. We even heard men like Buckminster Fuller projecting for that task force what housing could and should look like before the beginning of the next century. The Liberal