

Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) takes the following position as stated in an article in the *Globe and Mail* of May 31, 1972:

A federal Progressive Conservative government would make a priority of a revolving fund of \$100 million which could be used on a regional basis to set up residential land banking agencies according to opposition leader Robert Stanfield.

These remarks were made to the delegates of the Urban Development Institute at their annual meeting. This apparent ambivalence on the part of the official opposition party, where their leader takes the position that a total of \$100 million will be the panacea to the land problem, is at variance with the hon. member for Calgary North who maintains that \$100 million a year over the next five years is insufficient.

The funding allocation of \$500 million over the next five years is a lot more than has ever been used in the past in the context of comprehensive provincial and local development plans which are directed explicitly to the principle of serviced land at reasonable cost. In the past, the provinces have used the funds allocated for this purpose in the capital budget of CMHC. The \$100 million per annum is to be supported by a larger flow of funds for the extension of sewage trunk lines and sewage treatment plants, so that the federal commitment in regard to the development of land amounts to over \$1 billion for the next five years.

• (2050)

If this is not enough, hon. members may be assured that the minister will come back here and ask for more. In view of the experience of the last few years, in which not a single province or number of provinces asked for nearly as much money as we are making available, that \$100 million is certainly more than adequate, to start with anyway. It is not so much the money, however, that is important as the intent and determination to spend the money in the context of a type of development policy that until now we have not had in this country. We cannot simply buy our way out of difficulties that beset the land development process. We have, rather, to see it as an essential requirement of public policy to look to the orderly and harmonious growth of our cities and to develop strategies and programs at all three levels of government as a matter of continuous consultation and co-operation.

With respect to Pickering, the hon. member for Calgary North was correct when talking of the cost to the federal government, in acquiring these 25,000 acres, as being in the order of \$94 million. However, what he fails to appreciate is that this development will take place over a three-year period starting in 1972. In fact, provision has already been made in the 1972 capital budget of CMHC for an initial allocation of \$40 million toward the federal share of the cost of this project. This leaves a balance of some \$54 million to be funded in 1973 and 1974 for this purpose which will be met out of the land assembly fund allocation to Ontario in these years. This, then, leaves a substantial balance, in the order of \$73 million, for each of the next two years to meet needs elsewhere.

Another point that the hon. member for Calgary North raised was that the recommendations made by the Hellyer task force had not been acted upon and that this report was gathering dust. I am not sure where the hon. member

was in 1969, but he may recall the amendments to the National Housing Act in that year which incorporated nearly all the recommendations made by the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) subsequent to his resignation from cabinet.

Mr. Woolliams: Why did he resign?

Mr. Watson: Thus, in the 1969 amendments legislative effect was given to such recommendations as freeing the interest rate for NHA loans, permitting five-year, roll-over mortgages, increasing loan ratios, extending amortization terms, reducing insurance fees, making loans for land assembly purposes, streamlining procedures by removing the necessity for order in council approval under a number of programs, and so forth. Other recommendations, particularly those governing public housing, did not require legislative amendment and were implemented as a result of policy changes. The discontinuance of the urban renewal program also largely resulted from these recommendations. Thus, nearly all the recommendations in one form or another were implemented by the federal government. However, we must admit that many of those recommendations fell under the jurisdiction of other levels of government and in most cases those recommendations have not been acted upon.

The other issue raised by the hon. member is that there should be municipal representation in the tri-level consultative process. This is the whole purpose of the consultative process, namely, to provide a forum whereby the three levels of government can sit down as equal partners and review urban problems which are a cause of common concern. A meaningful beginning has been made in this direction, as evidenced by the consultations held last fall, and this is to be followed up with further sessions taking place later this year. Negotiations are going forward with a view to the setting up of these meetings later this year. It was the expressed intention of the minister, as soon as he was appointed to his portfolio, to act with respect to these tri-level meetings and to increase the number of times that they could be held each year.

The hon. member for Calgary North suggested that CMHC, being a Crown corporation, is not accountable to the minister and should therefore be made a department so that the minister could control its operations. I point out to the hon. member that the enabling legislation for CMHC, namely, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act, does provide in section 5(5) that the corporation shall comply with any directive from time to time given to it by the governor in council or the minister respecting the exercise or performance of its powers, duties and functions.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. I am well aware of the section to which he referred. Is it not possible that the president of CMHC or other members of the organization could say, "We will not carry out this order in council. We will not abide by it"? Would it not be better if the corporation were like any other government department? In the carrying out of government policy, it would be responsible to the minister. He would have greater control over it and there would be more liaison between that department and the minister. Would that not be better, instead of