

*Housing and Urban Renewal*

Experience showed, however, that many municipalities had neither the money nor the planning staffs to make this scheme a success. Therefore in 1967 the government proposed amendments to the act and from 1967 to the present time no initiative has been taken in this field even though cabinet approval was given. As to the second phase, assistance in the preparation of schemes, the municipalities were required to make a financial contribution amounting to 50 per cent, a demand which imposed further hardship on them.

The third stage of the implementation of the scheme turned out to be a real failure. Not only did the government impose a 50 per cent financial contribution but no provision was made in legislation or otherwise in connection with the setting up of schools, recreational centres, day care centres and the like. In addition, the expropriation laws prevailing at that time worked severe hardship on those who had to deal with urban renewal. Again, zoning regulations and tax structures further hampered any real development in the field.

When the hon. member for Trinity, the integrated one-man band in the housing field, set forth in his task force report the notion that urban renewal and public housing were the areas of failure, making them the whipping boys, he did a great disservice to Canada. Since that time there has been a freeze on housing and urban renewal; only a slight thaw has been noticeable on the part of the minister presently in charge of housing. Is it any wonder he is only perpetuating the failure of the government in the field of urban renewal?

We in the New Democratic Party believe there should be active participation and partnership among the three levels of government together with all others involved in urban renewal. We ask the minister to call an immediate conference of all departments and agencies of government which are concerned in this matter. Second, we call for active federal leadership and initiative in helping to solve the problems of urban renewal. We heard the minister say he is making an allocation of a mere \$25 million a year toward urban renewal. This is a serious disappointment to us. We ask for further financial assistance in this area so that the municipalities and provincial governments can play a more active part in attacking one of the main causes of the difficulties which beset our cities today. We in the NDP are greatly disappointed in the minister's statement.

[Mr. Gilbert.]

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the unanimous consent of the House under Standing Order 43 to move a motion which I shall place before you in a few moments. I may say as evidence of the urgency attached to this request that I decided to seek consent to this motion only after hearing the hon. member for Cochrane speak this afternoon.

The present Standing Orders in relation to private members' bills are part hypocrisy and part stupidity. I feel that private members should at the earliest opportunity be provided with a better method of putting forward their public bills. Therefore I ask the consent of the House to move the following motion:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization review Standing Orders dealing with Private Members' Public Bills with a view to making a report to the House with a recommendation that changes be made including the right to allow a recorded vote on some of such bills.

As further evidence of urgency may I say that this motion closely parallels a motion which appears in my name under private members' motions as No. 39, and that I am foregoing my right to make a speech on it by putting forward at this time the motion which I have just read.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the hon. member for Peace River under the terms of Standing Order 43 which requires unanimous agreement. Is there such unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** No.

**An hon. Member:** Your own backbenchers will turn against you.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** You did not want to talk about it last year.

**BROADCASTING ACT**

**PROVISION OF EQUAL TELEVISION TIME FOR ELECTION CANDIDATES**

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-174, to amend the Broadcasting Act.