

Add this frustration to that faced by producers, manufacturers, small businesses, the construction industry, the legitimately unemployed and you have a vague idea how a power-hungry, couldn't-care-less government carries out its duties and responsibilities.

The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) gave sound advice to the government, but apparently they do not intend to follow his advice. What about inflation, anyway? Obviously, the government members do not have any proposals of their own to curb the rising cost of production. As an example, last winter we saw a rise of from 100 per cent to 150 per cent in the price of anti-freeze alone. We have seen a fearful rise in the cost of food. Sugar alone is up 50 per cent. What will this do to beekeepers who require vast quantities of sugar to provide for hives until the productive season commences? This perhaps will answer the question of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), who raised the same point this afternoon. I received a call from a constituent who will need 15 tons of sugar. What will this 50 per cent hike do to the price of honey?

A contractor asked me for information on the continually spiralling cost of construction material. He was considering a contract to extend over 18 months and involving \$500,000, but was afraid to enter into a binding agreement without any control being placed on the skyrocketing rise in price for the material required.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of the prices of different types of material. In December, 1973, the price of two-inch pipe per 100 feet was \$112.50 in February of 1974 it was \$211.20, a 90 per cent increase in price. Three-inch pipe in December was \$150 per 100 feet; in February it had risen to \$251.20. Four-inch pipe was \$159 per 100 feet; in February it was \$310. As I said, Mr. Speaker, that is a 90 per cent increase in four months. How can this contractor submit a contract and feel financially safe?

On top of that, there is a shortage of material. He normally orders 100 tons of sheet steel one year and 200 tons the next year. Normally he uses 150 tons of steel. In January, February and March he ordered 100 tons of steel; he received no allotment. For April, May and June he ordered another 100 tons of steel; he was allotted 40 tons. How can these people survive in conditions such as this and with a government that stands idly by and allows this sort of thing to take place? What can such soaring costs do but hamper home construction, industry, in fact any type of business, not to mention the wage earner who finds

The Address—Mr. Towers

himself with less to spare for food and other necessities of life as each month goes by?

We all know how important it is for a young couple to be able to acquire their own home. At today's prices, most newly married couples cannot even save the down payment. And if they are fortunate enough to squeeze out the down payment after much scrimping and sacrifice, they cannot meet the monthly payments. When they look ahead and realize that they will be paying three or four times the contract price for their home due to high interest charges, life immediately becomes less interesting and they have a feeling that they will be plodding to pay for most of their lives. If homes were available at decent or reasonable amounts there would be fewer social problems. Young families should not be compelled to live under circumstances that place pressures on marriages and where children enter the world with unhappy, disillusioned parents.

Surveys conducted on crime have revealed that the majority of offenders come from environments of uncertainty, and in some cases have parents who were burdened beyond their ability to meet the demands that society had placed upon them. Those of us who have never had to stop to think about purchasing a home, or who have never felt insecure in our family life, perhaps cannot visualize what the day to day scrimping, worrying, never-ending anxieties can do to a person's general outlook. I do not think it would be unfair to say that the federal government could cut some of the many millions of dollars it now proposes to spend on government structures, which are certainly not needed. Renovations, expensive trappings for offices, multiplication of staff, uncalled for trips by government officials and public servants could total several million dollars.

● (1710)

Almost daily we have new reports of fantastic plans for growth in buildings and other government expenditures. I do not believe this is at all necessary at a time when so many taxpayers are finding it impossible to even purchase food and other daily requirements. A cutback in unnecessary government spending would be a step in the right direction. This is a step this government has never been prepared to take, but I hope that it will be taken during this second session of the twenty-ninth parliament. There must be a start some time—and it should be now during this serious time of inflation in the year 1974.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

At 5:12 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.