

National Housing Act

public housing. We still do not have the magic answer for that. We want to make people productive. The vandalism and juvenile delinquency in these places because the people are unhappy is appalling. They are stigmatized when they live in places like Regent's Park. It is costing us hundreds of millions of dollars anyway. It is not that we are not spending the money; we are spending the money. If we do not spend it in the proper way it will cost us more in the form of added welfare programs and police and fire protection.

I agree with the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation should be able to get together with the builders, developers, designers, creators, and architects to establish once and for all the proper criteria for public housing and establish once and for all the proper criteria for environmental factors because a house with a roof and four rooms is not enough. We should make ownership possible with incentives.

I like the part of this legislation which has to do with the rehabilitation of older properties. This is not so spectacular. The politicians cannot go out and turn the sod and put up big signs, but there is much to be said for the rehabilitation of old properties in the older section of Toronto to which my friend the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) referred. They are not so spectacular but these properties do not have to be serviced and would give us decent housing even though the stock of housing would not be increased immediately.

I should like to congratulate the minister for having been chosen as the minister, even without portfolio, in charge of housing. This is his exclusive problem now. Up until now we have spent millions of dollars on housing but it has been considered to be a secondary function or a kind of illegitimate responsibility which was assumed under the rubric of another portfolio or another responsibility. It is high time this ended and I am glad the Prime Minister has ended it. Housing is not solely a federal responsibility. Whether we like it or not this is so. These are the facts of life.

● (4:50 p.m.)

I think the minister will have to build a little fire under the officials of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I do not concur in everything that the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) said, but I believe we

[Mr. Givens.]

should do more research and experimentation than we have done in the past. We are still laying bricks like we laid them 100 years ago; we are still laying sewer pipe like we did 100 years ago. We would still be driving horses and buggies if the motor car industry had not been more progressive in its methods than has been the case with the construction of housing.

I know that C.M.H.C. has scholarships and I know that the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) is spending \$550 million this year for assistance to universities, even though it is unconstitutional. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have not produced in this country one urbanologist. We do not have one Pat Monahan, nor do we have one James Jacobs in this country. Why, I ask you?

Another thing that the task force talked about was the model city. Let us not throw that in the scrap can. I do not care if we do not build a model city in this country for the next 15 or 20 years. This bothers me very little, but I think it is high time we turned loose the brains of this country to design a model city with transportation corridors and ideal environmental factors so that we can use it as a sort of prototype. As we are developing our cities and adding to our urban areas we can pick up good ideas from this prototype and make practical, pragmatic use of them. This is what we should be spending money on today instead of the helter-skelter, hybrid type of development that we see around the fringe of every urban area in this country.

I think we need the co-operation of the provinces because housing is their responsibility. They should change their assessment laws. Why should it be cheaper to tear down buildings for the construction of universities or apartment buildings than to keep these buildings properly maintained so people can live in them? Why should it be necessary, when improvements are made to a house such as will now be possible under this legislation, for the assessment and the taxes to be increased?

We should get the provinces to co-operate in servicing vacant land. They should help to establish transportation corridors. I do not know why this subject has not been talked about yet. If it is constitutionally proper for the federal government to spend billions of dollars for the assembly of land, why should it be constitutionally impossible to assemble land for the purpose of creating a transportation corridor? This is the only thing that will