

*Tight Money Policy*

During the past three years we have been experiencing a boom in apartment building and house building generally. I suggest the major reason for this dramatic improvement over the past three years has been the completely new and fresh approach taken by the government toward some of the most vexing housing problems that have faced our country. In June, 1964, this house passed a major piece of legislation updating the National Housing Act to meet the modern needs and conditions of our cities. A variety of measures were introduced aimed at placing adequate housing within the reach of all Canadians. These amendments took the form of additional assistance for housing and urban renewal in Canada.

I might summarize the amendments in the field of assistance for housing and urban renewal in Canada in this way: Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was authorized to join the provinces and municipalities in redeveloping and rehabilitating urban renewal areas in accordance with official plans. Before these amendments were introduced federal assistance was largely restricted to those areas with a housing content before or after clearance only. This restriction was removed. Federal assistance was then made available to provinces and municipalities that prepared urban renewal schemes which entailed all the necessary economic, social and technical research and planning required for the renewal area whether it was industrial, commercial or housing before or after. The federal government paid half the cost of preparing such schemes and half the cost of implementing them. The implementation of the scheme consisted of the acquisition of land, clearance of land where necessary and also, for the first time, the provision of municipal services and works other than buildings. Then, Mr. Speaker, grants were also made available to the provinces or to the municipalities covering 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  per cent of the provincial or municipal share of the cost of implementing such urban renewal schemes.

I touch on these facts very briefly because of my experience as an alderman in the city of Hamilton and as a member of parliament. Hamilton has pioneered in the field of urban renewal. I suggest that city could not have done a great deal of the work which it is now undertaking without these amendments. I go further than suggesting; I say emphatically that they could not have done this work. It is the cores of the cities across our country that require redevelopment today, and this work

[Mr. Macaluso.]

was not possible before the amendments of 1964. It is for this reason I have reviewed this legislation in the light of the amendment put forward today.

There is no drying up of government funds for urban renewal projects across the country. Provinces and municipalities need only make application and come up with a proper plan. Today the government still has a great deal of the funds provided by the house in the amendments of 1965, at which time \$300 million was allotted for this work. Some of this money is still available for this type of work. Let us not be fooled by a general amendment to the effect that today urban renewal in our cities cannot continue or cannot commence because of the tight money policy. This is not a fact. These moneys have been approved by parliament and they are still there. There has been no indication from the government that this fund, allocated for this purpose, has dried up. I know personally, as a matter of fact, that it has not.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The amendments of 1964 also provided for assistance for public housing. At that time the legislation governing federal-provincial public housing was amended to permit the construction of hostel or dormitory accommodation, including the purchase of existing housing, for rental to low income individuals. This was new and very important legislation. Again, I refer to the city of Hamilton's north end redevelopment project where the municipal and provincial governments have acquired a number of properties, rehabilitated them and rented them to families with low incomes. This was not possible before the 1964 amendments but I suggest it is possible today. There has been no drying up of funds for this kind of purchase of existing homes for public housing purposes to rehabilitate low income families in this country.

Further, as an alternative way of producing public housing C.M.H.C. was authorized by the legislation to make 90 per cent loans to provinces, to municipalities or to an agency of the provinces or municipalities, for the provision of public housing accommodation, either existing or new, for low-income individuals or families, and to make contributions, it must be noted, Mr. Speaker, of up to 50 per cent of operating losses on such accommodation. These funds are still available; there has been no drying up of government funds for low-income housing purposes.

For example, in the province of Ontario the Ontario Housing Corporation held the