

Housing

social pathology in the form of riots or protests against an inhuman environment, poisoned air in the overloaded corridors—higher death and accident rates—of movement, and economic blight because we have let unit costs increase beyond all reason. The sooner we wake up and learn something about the conditions in which the people live, the sooner we will have better cities and a better country to live in.

Must we persist with poisoned air? Must we continue to overload our existing transportation corridors? Must we continue to be bogged down with the economic plight we have because, through our unit cost of land and unit cost of anything, we have let any chance to create a better life slip out of our hands in terms of control.

All over the world logical answers to the problem of taming megalopolis and guiding giant city growth to human well-being are available. Canada lags notably in the application of these methods and we have neglected the basic research. The prognosis for urban Canada is grave. On this point, I believe every member agrees. But the future forms and patters of our urban development need not inevitably be more of the same. Rates of growth on the scales predicted mean we can rebuild the environment as we see fit. We should recognize then an open-ended set of demands for as long as we can foresee will be made upon the space and resources of our urban areas.

In terms of the form and pattern of urban development, we need to think in relation to the needs of 50 or 100 years from now. Even though we have little idea of how life might be lived, what we do in this massive urbanization is forever and will affect the quality of life for most Canadians for many centuries from today. What we do today in this decade will affect planning for the next 200 years if we do not do it right and do not get off our rear ends and start to act. I see my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I would have liked to have been able to go on much longer.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is getting late. As various speakers who preceded me have taken part in this debate, I have found bit by bit some of the material which I wanted to present to the house has been used. However, they say repetition is the mother of learning. Perhaps a recap of some of the main items might be of interest. I feel this is an important and very interesting debate. I believe it has given this house an opportunity once

more to review and assess its position on one of the major problems facing Canadians today. It has clearly set the picture of the housing crisis in its proper perspective. The resignation yesterday of the Minister of Transport, and the reasons he gave for relinquishing his number two spot in the government of this country, have shaken thoughtful Canadians to the core. The general public expects criticism of government policy from members of the opposition party. However, when one of our key cabinet ministers resigns in protest over weak, ineffective and indecisive government policy, and when he warns all Canadians that we are headed in the wrong direction, that we are weakening our central government, it is certainly time for the general public to turn the searchlight on the policies of the present administration.

It is time for the government members in this house to assess their own position. A disastrous course set by the government today could bring real and increasing trouble to our nation before the term of this parliament expires. The resignation of the Minister of Transport has been a tragic one. It has brought to all Canadians the fact that the present administration does not have a solution to many of the major problems facing our nation. It is high time this government set down a clearcut policy on a number of issues so that all Canadians would know where we are heading.

We have seen indecision and delay in respect of a number of issues. These include housing, urban development, pollution, foreign policy, unemployment, pensions, regional development and many other problems. Let us look briefly at the resignation statement of the minister. He did not give up his post merely because of a lack of policy in the housing field. His statement is a stinging repudiation of this new administration. It is a castigation of present government policies. It is a warning to the Canadian people, and it is a plea to the members of the government to change direction.

In looking over the resignation statement which the minister gave to the press and to the people of Canada yesterday, I note the minister pointed out that he felt the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was pursuing a policy which was resulting in a federation of ten semi-autonomous states held together by a weak federal government. This is not a statement coming from opposition members in the house. This is a statement coming from the number two man in the Liberal party, the number two man in the government of this