

*Housing Prices*

street patterns and shopping facilities, transportation, poor government housekeeping and social services. The federal and provincial governments are responsible for setting proper priorities within their fiscal resource plans. Where are these plans? Every year the estimates increase and each year there are the same complaints of the inadequate social program of this government. Adequate resources should be provided by this government, available to municipalities on a continuing basis for conservation, improvement and redevelopment of existing neighbourhoods and newly created ones. This should be done in a way that would protect our past and prevent slums.

Conservation and improvement of neighbourhoods for low and moderate income residential neighbourhoods is especially important in facilitating the involvement of neighbourhood residents to plan and implement. The present government thus far has failed to introduce a social plan that would preserve neighbourhoods. It is time a program was introduced to make grants and loans available, within a ceiling, to local neighbourhoods.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired. The hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth).

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** Mr. Speaker, I express my thanks for your allowing me to take part in this debate because I have looked forward to it for some time. In bringing this matter before Parliament for public debate through an opposition motion, we hoped we would receive constructive help from the government and a constructive indication of what the program would be. As usual and as might have been anticipated, government members, the minister included, have dwelt on their accomplishments in this field. They indicated, as usual, that Canadians have never had it so good. Also as is usual with an upcoming election, they promise tremendous amendments in respect of this very serious problem. This is not good enough. This is not the type of action the people of Canada want from this or any other government so far as housing is concerned.

Listening to speakers from the government benches, one would almost believe they do not realize how serious this problem is and how many Canadians it affects at all levels, low-income, middle-income and even upper-income. Something must be radically wrong with the economic environment of a country when the government calmly assumes that a person earning under \$8,000 a year has no business attempting to own his own home and, calmly assumes that young people should be tied up financially for 40 years in an attempt to pay for a home.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you were as impressed and awed by the figures put on the record as I was. They indicated that people who buy and attempt to pay for their homes will pay four times over before they have met their obligation. This situation will not be tolerated in Canada. We will have more improvisations which will cause more difficulty than we have at the present time.

I was not at all impressed when the minister told us the number of homes which have been constructed. If I heard him correctly, he said that this year 230,000 starts would be made. He did not indicate how many units the depart-

ment and the people of Canada decree as the absolute minimum which must be built every year. He did not say that in the last four years we have fallen behind the 100,000 starts which is the minimum needed. This is why the type of facts and figures placed on the record by government members can be misleading: they do not tell the story.

When they talk about accomplishments, the accomplishments are not enough when people cannot have a place to live in this country of ours. When my associates talk about the necessity for further construction and meaningful consultation among the three levels of government, this certainly is what is needed. What we see now is the development of land for mobile homes. We see trailers being set up in the back yards of existing homes and alongside existing houses. This compounds the problem in respect of sewage disposal, ecology, schools and so on.

Some of these houses are actually in gravel pits. As my colleague, the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan), pointed out, some people actually live in converted buses, trailers and in even worse conditions. When we tolerate such a situation in Canada something is totally wrong and must be corrected. We cannot wait for amendments which may come some time in the future. This is not good enough. This government has been in office through two Parliaments and has had an opportunity to improve the housing situation in Canada. It has not done so. What is the alternative?

**Mr. Basford:** Not you.

**Mr. Danforth:** The minister says it is not me. I assume he means my party.

**Mr. Basford:** Nothing personal.

**Mr. Danforth:** Mr. Speaker, my party and my colleagues feel that the approaches taken by this government are no different than those taken through the years which have proven to be ineffective. That is our objection. We feel there should be a brand new approach. If this government can allocate up to \$1,000 million for the creation of a new international airport, with all it means to the environment and the surrounding country, the small municipalities and towns and everything that goes with it, is it not true that we could spend the same amount of money on creating new municipalities where they are needed?

• (1640)

When we think that today we are creating uranium factories and plants for the creation of energy in the form of electricity, and that these plants must be built on the side of large bodies of water to get rid of excess energy in the form of heat, does it not seem logical, plausible and practical to build such plants as the source and centre of a municipality and to use all this extra energy to provide heat and energy for our housing developments? Does it not seem plausible that when we have to construct networks of roads and railroads and services for these types of plants, they should be utilized also for the development of municipalities?

Does it not seem plausible and practical that we should take some of our submarginal land for this type of estab-