

It ill behooves any of us in this house to try to create this impression throughout the country. Public housing is an important field. A lot of work has been done in this field. When I heard the hon. member speak of the tight money policy, and here I am relating my remarks to housing and urban renewal, I at once thought of the niggardly increase from \$25 million to \$50 million made by the former government in the years from 1957 to 1963 with respect to urban renewal and public housing.

I think hon. members opposite should be the last to talk about a tight money policy as it affects housing and urban development across this country. During the period from 1957 to 1963 the only amendment to the National Housing Act for urban renewal purposes was an increase in the statutory limitation from \$25 million to \$50 million. If that was not tight money or a retrograde step in urban renewal in this country, I do not know what was.

The bill before the house in 1965 sought to amend the National Housing Act further to increase to \$300 million the funds available for purposes of urban renewal and for the purposes of public housing that accompany urban renewal. Passage of the bill by the house assured that Canadian urban renewal projects would boom, as they have done. This program involving housing for our low-income groups—

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Macaluso:—was introduced to make sure that there would be no restriction through lack of funds in carrying out those worth-while objectives.

I feel very strongly about urban development in this country. In my view we have fallen behind a great deal. I do not say that the government should take all the credit for the improvements brought about by the 1964 amendments but I do feel that credit ought to go where it is deserved. I believe that credit should be given to the government for bringing in a crash program, for bringing forward the amendments of 1964 and for providing the funds to implement the amendments.

More has to be done in the fields of public housing and urban renewal. More can be done. The provinces, the municipalities and the federal government have been working together and must continue to work together closely.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I again say that my purpose in rising to speak on this particular question is to refute the impression being sought to be conveyed that a tight money policy affects housing and urban renewal development in this country. The money is there. All the provinces and the municipalities have to do is ask for it.

Mr. Hales: May I call it six o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before an hon. member calls it six o'clock, I should bring to the attention of the house that the following subject is to be considered this evening pursuant to provisional standing order 39A: The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herdridge), Power—Columbia River—reported increase in anticipated cost.

Pursuant to special order made earlier this day I do now leave the chair, it being six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

SUPPLY

FINANCE—TIGHT MONEY POLICY—NEGATIVE APPROACH TO PROBLEMS

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp for committee of supply, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hees.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make a few remarks on the supply motion now before the house, and particularly the amendment moved which embodies the very important economic matter of loans for house building in Canada. Before I proceed further I should like to draw to the attention of my hon. friend from Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso) to the fact that he seemed to stray from the amendment, and in order to put the record straight I think it would be as well to