

Why should Canada make itself conspicuous with the slogan "Habitat 2000" at the United Nations Conference-Exposition in Vancouver in 1973 if, after learning nothing from the Montreal "Habitat '67" project, it did not succeed as a rich country in making available from 1968 to 1976 to the average Canadian family a single family home?

Before concluding my speech, since I have two minutes left, I hasten to say that we, of the Official Opposition, are not the only ones to say that this program of \$100 million in support of demonstration programs is an untimely decision in view of inflation, a fraud and window-dressing. Our colleagues of the Social Credit and of the New Democratic Party condemned it quite unequivocally today, yesterday and as soon as the program was announced. The NDP member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) compared it to the huge project of Habitat '67, and I spare this House his statement on the subject.

As a result, we have to take concrete steps today and the only weapon available to us is to show, through the motion before the House and by the vote we will have tonight, to demonstrate clearly and unequivocally that the government is on a bad course in the area of housing.

In view of the failure, or at least of the serious procrastination of the government in the field of energy, inflation control and in view of its irresponsibility in the field of housing, we have to defeat it in order to enable the electors to choose as a government the representatives of a political party that is more familiar with the problems, that is more conscious of today's priorities and to give ourselves a new leadership, not a leadership like the one we witnessed during the question period today, tossed about between two ministers, two heads, two groups, and goodness knows what else!

If the Liberals have once again the hope to get tonight the support of the members of the New Democratic Party, the latter should realize that Canadians as a whole and very soon, on April 2 next, the citizens of Nova Scotia in particular, will judge very severely the vote of the New Democratic Party tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the question to ask oneself, and I conclude my remarks on this, is not whether we must defeat the government, but rather whether we have to let it administer the country from bad to worse another day and let it another day powerless in the face of its responsibility as national conciliator.

**Mr. Guay (Lévis):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to point out to the House that I regret having given my unanimous consent, because I have heard nothing of substance from the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. Is the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) rising on a question of privilege?

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** No, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. member allow me to ask him a brief question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** The unanimous consent of the House would be required, because the time of the hon. member has expired.

### Urban Affairs

**Mr. Wagner:** The hon. member may ask me a question, brief or otherwise, at any time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Does the House consent?

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Fortin:** No, Mr. Speaker, we have wasted enough time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. I have heard a "no". The House does not consent.

[English]

**Mr. Ian Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) and a number of others who belong to the small "c" hard core of what used to be called the Progressive Conservative Party, must be very pleased with themselves today. The motion they have brought forward certainly does not indicate much hope in the small "c" conservative group for any progressive ideas.

The government of Canada has decided to launch a program which will allow at least 20, and I hope a lot more, practical projects across Canada, to be phased in over a five-year period. Hopefully some will be used to show the world what Canada can do to solve some of its urban problems in conjunction with the conference on man's urban environment which is to take place in Vancouver in 1976. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is an effort through which we in Canada can attempt to show the world what is possible in the way of solutions to the ever-growing urban problems of the world; surely, this effort for the brotherhood of man is worthy of more support than the kind of motion of non-confidence put to this House today. The progressive section of the Conservative Party, if that section remains at all, must be a disillusioned group in this House today.

I declared yesterday my whole-hearted support for this program that the official opposition chooses to view so cynically. They pretend that the money spent to help make Canadian cities better places to live in, ignores the needs of Canadians. The small "c" conservative group in the House chooses to pretend that a program which will allow for innovation in housing, urban transit and urban pollution control, somehow denies Canadians who are in need of a home, that very home. It chooses to pretend that the fund is just for housing; it chooses to pretend that the fund is for airy-fairy research study projects when it knows no government in its right mind would try to sell this kind of research to people whose needs are pressing and vital. No government would propose the kind of program that the opposition pretends this program is.

Mr. Speaker, opposition members choose to overlook the fact that the urban demonstration program is more than just a fund—it is also a means of exchanging the best solutions that Canadians in all parts of Canada have found for urban problems. This program is one of the most exciting ventures undertaken anywhere in the world to attack, solve, and demonstrate solutions to urban problems. It will give Canada a major innovative capability in