

Housing

experience. I have had experience in respect of urban renewal and land assembly. I would again urge the government and the new minister of housing, whoever he might be, to take a very serious look at the amount of red tape that is involved. I know that in St. John's it took something like seven or eight years to obtain approval and have a start made on a land assembly area. While I do not mean to suggest that all the delays are caused by the federal government and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, I do say that the biggest contributing factor to the delays involved is the red tape in Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I believe I can cite another case in my riding where plans have been made for an urban renewal scheme for close to a decade. So far as I can find out the plans for that scheme are still on the drawing board.

I do not think it is right to build up the hopes of the people or give them the impression there will be some grandiose scheme for urban renewal and so on, then keep them dangling for five, seven and sometimes ten years. I urge the government and the new minister to take a very serious look at this red tape and do what they can to have it eliminated. I would also ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and the government to show a little kindness and compassion for the less fortunate people by no longer concentrating on the large financial interests. I ask that they think about the need of the newly married Canadians, the people in the middle and low income brackets who, without this help, understanding and compassion, can never hope to own their own homes.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, it was certainly an amazing speech we heard today from the Prime Minister. This debate is being held today because the minister in charge of housing, the Deputy Prime Minister, the man who was at least formerly the number two man in the government has resigned. One would have thought—and I am sure the public expected—the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would have taken this first opportunity to explain to the people of Canada and members of parliament why the man in charge of housing resigned. What were the differences between the minister and the Prime Minister? What did the minister want to do that could not be done? Did the minister's plans with regard to improving the housing stock in Canada flounder because the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) said there is

not sufficient money? Or did they flounder because, as the minister said in his press conference, the Prime Minister's views on the constitution are so rigid that he could not proceed? Surely, the people of Canada were entitled to expect that the Prime Minister would come into the house and explain precisely what happened.

Instead, the Prime Minister came into this house and gave a speech which sounded as if he were reading a shopping list. He gave us a list of the tremendous things which have been done in the field of housing under this government. He ignored completely the Minister of Transport. It was as if the minister did not exist. I could not help but be reminded of the way the late dictator of the Soviet Union used to deal with his colleagues with whom he disagreed. When Stalin disagreed with somebody he became a non-person; history was immediately rewritten as if he never existed. That is what the Prime Minister did today. It was as if Mr. Hellyer had never existed, was never in this parliament and was never a minister or in charge of housing.

I suggest that the Prime Minister ought to have dealt with the issues raised by the Deputy Prime Minister or I suppose now the former deputy prime minister. A number of excellent speeches were made here this afternoon but I submit there was no more damning indictment of this government made here today by members of the opposition than was made yesterday by the minister. I should like to place on the record some of the things the minister said to which I believe the Prime Minister should have replied. I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), the chief hatchet man of the Liberal government, is here. I hope he will take on the job as he has taken on so many other unpleasant tasks for the government. The fact that the minister is in this house, I suppose is an indication that there is no imminent settlement of the Air Canada strike. Otherwise, he would be getting his picture in the paper. I do not blame him for that.

Let me quote a few of the statements made by the Minister of Transport as reported in the *Globe and Mail* for Friday April 25. Mr. Hellyer said that the interpretation the Prime Minister placed on federalism was as follows:

—a theory of ten virtually autonomous provinces held together by the strings of a fairly weak federal government.

He said further:

I can't personally accept a theory of federalism which, however attractive it is in principle, is not viable from the standpoint of meeting the