

*The Address—Mr. Sulatycky*

selves into cities. Only there could they find the richness and variety of stimulation that make for creativity, the massed resources and economies of scale that make possible the greatest enterprises. But today, thanks to advances in communication, transportation and the arts of organization, we can provide these conditions at any point on the map that strikes our fancy. So the questions become: How can we best use land space? What patterns of settlement and open space best serve our purposes? How can we revitalize rural areas, create new cities, and overhaul existing cities in ways that serve human needs, the requirements of economic vitality and the claims of beauty?

The answer to these questions is certainly not by crowding more and more people into the largest cities. One further observation which one can make from viewing the developments of urbanization in the United States is that although more and more people crowd into and around the cities, fewer and fewer people wish to live there. In a Gallup poll taken last year it was found that most Americans would live in a small town or on a farm if they had their choice. Only 18 per cent really desired to live in cities.

In Canada we have the opportunity to create for our people the greatest variety of living environments. That should be the prime objective of the new ministry of urban affairs. To reach it we will have to devise acceptable means for influencing the location of economic activity. We should not hesitate, if necessary, to conscript capital for this purpose. There is no doubt that government alone cannot provide all the funds necessary for this purpose. If our existing financial institutions fail to meet the needs and the demands of growth in smaller centres, mechanisms must be developed to compel these institutions to apportion some of their available resources to such communities. I would say that if the same institutions fail to meet the needs of the larger cities, we should not hesitate to compel them to apply their resources in ways which are of the greatest benefit in the opinion of the people of the country rather than in the opinion of the directors of the corporations alone. These funds should not be limited to housing and to industrial activity but should provide capital for industrial expansion and commercial expansion as well as for the services usually required in municipalities.

Any program that will improve our large cities will succeed only if it is tied to a program to increase the over-all number of cities in this country. We must ensure that we have not only a number of very large cities but that we have many small cities—small, but lively and thriving—spread throughout the country. I suggest this is the direction which must be followed if we are to succeed in any urban policy in this country.

In summation, I should like to refer again to the points I have attempted to make. I believe one of the tasks of the ministry of urban affairs should be to take an inventory of existing communities in Canada to determine which are capable of sustaining public growth and to ensure that these communities do not suffer because of increased emphasis being placed on the larger cities. I believe we should ensure that capital for housing, commercial and industrial development is made available to the smaller as well as to the larger centres. Only then, I believe, will we develop a sound system of geographic

[Mr. Sulatycky.]

development in this country and a sound settlement pattern providing for the people of Canada the opportunities which this land should make available to them.

● (8:10 p.m.)

[Translation]

**Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to the movers of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne (Messrs. A. B. Douglas and Trudel). They performed their tasks extremely well.

This debate is giving me and other hon. members a chance to criticize the present government for its lack of decision and imagination when it comes to meeting its obligations. This debate enables me also to let the proper authorities know of the conditions prevailing in my constituency and of the needs of my constituents.

Taking into account the promises made to them during the 1968 election campaign, Canadians were justified in believing that a Liberal government would offer them favourable conditions in all fields, and would solve problems quickly and completely.

However, even a brief examination or hasty review, of present conditions will show that the problems are still numerous. While they pile up one on top of the other, the government fails sadly in its obligations and does nothing to solve them.

Thus, I am not telling anybody anything when I say that inflation is still solidly established, that taxes have never been so high, that the present rate of unemployment is very high, that thousands of householders cannot earn a living for their families and that our industries, especially the textile and shoe industries, operate at a slow-down rate, when they are not completely closed, while imports increase at a frightening rhythm.

According to data from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the gross national product increased only by 1 per cent during the second half of the current year. For the first six months of the year, the number of dwelling units started was 40 per cent lower than last year.

From January to June new car sales were 15 per cent lower than for the same period last year and there were 75 per cent more bankruptcies.

This is in short where the Liberal government has led the country in return for the confidence the people put in it at the 1968 elections.

Mr. Speaker, since the present debate began, some Liberal members have accused the official opposition of obstructing the legislation proposed in the field of agriculture to help that deserving group of our society. They mentioned Bill C-196 and Bill C-197, blaming the opposition and particularly the official opposition for systematic obstruction.

We are conscious of having done our duty in this field as well as in others, and of having acted in the best interest of the farmers.

If we had accepted Bills C-196 and C-197 as they were introduced, the Canadian farmers would have been embarrassed by these two measures since, in both cases,