

ing thing, "In a borough you get to know the policeman, the postman, and you don't need a postal code; they know whether you live there or not. Also, you know the grocer." But the last sentence was the one which was so revealing. He said "When you die, someone mourns you." I believe it is so important that as we create urban cities and as we build houses in clusters in neighbourhoods we remember that what we are basically doing is to make certain that our great cities and our small cities will have 500 or 1,000 years of history.

It has been suggested that in the Middle Ages western man learned to think systematically about the realm of the personal. From the twelfth to the eighteenth century western man learned to think systematically and to manage the material world. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries we learned to think systematically and to manage organic things. We have not yet learned to understand persons as persons; we are still treating persons as things. To accomplish anything worth while, people working together with similar objectives and principles must replace programs and the erection of buildings.

Let me just tell you one very interesting experiment that happened in the heart of this city, which I think is perhaps one of the best things because it points the way. With respect to the Alta Vista Medical Health Centre in this city, the governors of the University of Ottawa after heart rending debate decided to take their medical faculty and put it out in the complex instead of keeping it in an educational ghetto in centre town. They are moving it out, and there the young medical students will be in touch with the community in which they will eventually practice. This is what we must do.

A philosopher once said, "We are made for co-operation, like feet, like hands, like eyelids". True co-operation co-ordinates the various parts for the general welfare of the community. It is through joint discussion and planning that we achieve action. In pioneer Canada, effort was co-operative. A home was built locally in a "house-raising". Tragically, today we inhibit local community-based action. We have almost come to the point where all help must be institutionalized and made part of some government structure. We establish a particular program with offices, a building, a budget, and everything starts to become impersonal and controlled. On one hand we urge responsibility and private initiative, and on the other we develop a society which is institutional and crushes human initiative.

One of the things I am most concerned with is this amalgamation of the ministry of housing and urban affairs with CMHC. It concerns me that we take what was to be structured, in my reading of the original act, as a think-tank, as a group that would bring together the forces in this country which plan urban development and housing, and suddenly it becomes, to use the Ottawa expression, the buzz word around here—something that has clout and can talk to the ministries and to some of these large urban centres. I do not think that is what it should have been and what it should be. The kind of clout that ministry should have is the clout of good ideas, the clout of bringing together all the forces which affect housing and urban planning. This ministry should have the clout of

vision and co-operative thinking, not the clout of some large ministry.

● (1252)

I would like to talk about some of the things that disturb me in connection with this part of government. The government has become institutionalized. It is too far from the real world. Changes were recently announced for 400,000 Canadians who have already invested in the Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan. This was done in midstream. Perhaps the alleged loopholes which are now closed were unjustified. Nevertheless, these changes impose hardships upon Canadians who have already invested in RHOSP's to purchase furniture or to engage in other purposes which were quite legal until April, 1977.

If you wish to buy furniture before the deadline, you must remember that only certain types of furniture and furnishings qualify. But these rules are vague. According to the regulations "eligible furnishings" means "furniture, appliances, curtains or carpeting, but for greater certainty does not include listed personal property or outdoor furniture or equipment." There are, however, many inconsistencies. Stair carpeting or wall-to-wall carpeting qualifies, apparently because of the word "carpeting". Bathroom or kitchen tile does not. That is a funny distinction. There is something that worries me. People who have lived and worked in this city are quite used to broadloom. The officials are used to large broadloomed offices. They forget that in other parts of Canada there is an awful lot of good old linoleum.

I often worry about those in the glass house across the way who are supposed to plan our industrial strategy. I do not know of many small or medium sized offices which have broadloom. Members opposite are so used to thinking in terms of football field offices with broadloom that they forget about the rest of Canada. They forget that most houses in this country have linoleum.

I now wish to talk about land. In my analysis of the challenges and problems of economic housing for Canadians, I found that the basic commodity is land. Five years ago in this city it was possible to buy a lot for less than \$10,000. Today a 60-foot lot costs between \$25,000 and \$30,000. While it can be argued that this is a provincial and municipal responsibility, the federal government should take a leadership role involving all parties in order to be certain of an adequate supply of land on the market. We must address ourselves to the land question.

I understand that a joint study is now in progress. I recognize that the cost of land is a very complicated issue. I hope the minister will address this whole area of land costs in order that there will be a meeting of minds and we can bring forward all points of view and philosophies. We cannot meet the future expectations of the Canadian people unless we address ourselves to what can be done about land costs.

Many of the programs of the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs have been directed at numbers. I can understand that. In September of this year the president of Central Mortgage and Housing looked forward to 1978 and expressed the hous-