

conomic Council of Canada as a background paper and entitled "Housing Demand to 1970".

The study states on page 30:

With respect to urban renewal, municipalities made use of a total of only \$3.2 million in 1963 for the purpose of acquiring and clearing blighted or substandard areas under the Federal cost-sharing arrangements. The principal barriers against more extensive use of these programs appear to have been institutional ones, particularly at the municipal level. But recently a few developments have emerged which may point to an accelerated pace of action. These are found in new legislation, in the streamlining of Government machinery, and also in certain apparent changes in attitudes. A number of legislative changes designed to improve such responses were introduced in June 1964.

This refers to the amendment in that year of the National Housing Act of 1954. It goes on:

These legislative changes would appear to offer increased scope and incentives for action in this field by provincial and municipal governments.

From this same technical study it appears that population growth is expected to be much more rapid in urban areas, particularly in the larger cities. Estimates suggest that by 1970 over 68 per cent of the population is expected to live in urban centres with populations of 5,000 or over. By 1970 it is estimated that between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of all new residential construction will be in urban centres having populations of more than 5,000.

Having made these remarks I should like to turn to the speech made by the hon. Member for Qu'Appelle, who has now set himself up as not only an agricultural expert but as the Conservative Party's expert on city affairs. As reported in *Hansard* for April 27 at page 664, the hon. Member referred to gaps in this legislation with respect to urban renewal. He said:

I know that when we were in office we put in the sections which provided money for cities to look at the problem, study it and begin to work out a plan. We also got ready to move the amendments which the Minister had the honour to move last year, so there is no question of not being willing to move with the times.

Let us look at the record to see whether they were willing to move with the times when they were in office. I say to the hon. Member for Qu'Appelle that he is completely wrong in his statement that they were ready to move such amendments. Such amendments were never on the order paper. Let us examine the record with regard to the National Housing Act.

A chronological review of urban renewal legislation gives a picture of its status before

### *National Housing Act*

and after the amendments introduced by this Government in June, 1964. Federal assistance for urban renewal activity in Canada was first provided through a 1949 amendment to the National Housing Act. Under these initial provisions financial contributions equal to half the costs involved in the acquisition and clearance of blighted areas were made available to municipalities. Grants were subject to the requirement that areas cleared would be replaced with new residential developments catering to low income families. This restriction on the re-use of cleared land was amended slightly in 1954 when the National Housing Act was revised to authorize the utilization of these areas for other public purposes as well as housing. It still had to be substantially residential development.

In 1956 a further change permitted Federal assistance where a substantial portion of the area—either before or after redevelopment—was devoted to residential purposes. Thus it became possible for land to be cleared and displaced families rehoused elsewhere, freeing the area for redevelopment for the most appropriate purpose as determined by the municipality. It was still clearance of substantially residential areas for substantially residential development.

During the period from 1957 to 1963, when the Conservative Government was in office, the Government in which the hon. Member for Qu'Appelle was a Member, 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, a paltry \$25 million for this great scheme of urban renewal. When this Government took office, after months of study with the provinces and the C.M.H.C., substantial amendments to the National Housing Act were introduced in Parliament and passed last June. They amounted to far reaching and flexible legislation providing additional incentives for urban renewal; contributions equal to half the costs incurred in preparing urban renewal schemes; contributions to meet half the costs of acquisition and clearance; contributions to meet half the costs involved—and this was a new and far reaching amendment—in the installation or improvement of municipal services and facilities in urban renewal areas; loans of up to two thirds of the Provincial or Municipal share of the cost of implementing a renewal scheme; loans for existing housing in urban renewal areas; and more important, Mr. Chairman, removal of the restriction that Federal assistance be