

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. There must be some decorum here. The hon. member for Rose-dale.

**Mr. Macdonald:** I can understand the hon. member trying to cut me off because he cannot bear to have the truth of the matter put on the record. I point out that if the hon. member was sincerely interested in bringing this matter to the attention of the provincial police or the municipal police authorities it was his obligation to do so.

**Mr. Coates:** I did not have to do so.

**Mr. Macdonald:** Did he bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister as the Prime Minister invited him to do? My information is that he did not. This is a rather cynical attempt at a partisan political attack and I think it can be rejected as of absolutely no value whatsoever.

**Mr. Clancy:** May I ask a question of the hon. member? Is he giving the policy of the government?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

HOUSING—REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION  
OF REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West):** Mr. Speaker, on June 10 I asked the Postmaster General the following question, as found on page 4152 of *Hansard*:

Now that the amendments to the National Housing Act have been passed by the house, will the minister cause further consideration to be given to extending federal government assistance to a proposed municipal project to acquire land for the redevelopment of an area in downtown Windsor for commercial purposes, and to similar projects throughout Canada?

I suggest that this is a matter of urgent interest and concern, Mr. Speaker, to many cities and towns throughout Canada, cities and towns that have downtown areas now used for commercial purposes which are fitting areas for urban renewal. Until the recent amendments to the National Housing Act the federal government, it was understood, could not participate in projects to acquire and clear such areas unless they were to be used later for housing purposes. But in many cases, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that a use involving housing would not have been and would not be the highest and best use, the most logical use for the land in question.

Many municipal governments felt they should be able to propose plans of urban renewal incorporating the most logical use for these downtown areas. Such a use in many

[Mr. Coates.]

cases would be commercial or even industrial. After all, there might already be commercial areas all around it, and to permit such land to be used later for commercial purposes might give further aid to the construction industry because of the more complicated buildings that would be involved.

Housing or apartment projects once built might give employment only to a few caretakers or maintenance men. Building housing commercial or industrial enterprises could well give employment to hundreds or even thousands. Also, commercial or industrial buildings could return a greater tax revenue to the municipality and, as one member of the house has suggested, such a use might be a further source of funds for the building of public housing elsewhere.

Now that the National Housing Act has been amended I think it most important to ask the question I placed before the house the other day, since it seems to me that there is some lack of understanding of the effect of these amendments on the part of certain municipal officials in some parts of Canada. In answering this question I hope the minister, who I am happy to see is in the house, will be able to clarify, therefore, exactly what the federal government will now be able to do and how far it can go in assisting in projects of urban renewal, where there are areas now used for commercial purposes and where it is proposed they be used later for similar purposes, because of the importance of facilitating renewal of the cores and hearts of our cities.

**Mr. Winch:** Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn for lack of a quorum. We are seven short.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not think I heard the hon. gentleman, and I think I see a quorum.

**Mr. Clancy:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. There is no reason why the hon. member who has just spoken could not have obtained an answer from his minister. He is a member of the government. We are wasting our time. This is our grievance period, not the government's. They can do anything they want and they have the power to do it. He has wasted ten minutes now. Why did he not see the minister?

**Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General):** When this question was asked in the course of the debate on June 2, I said that the answer had been given in my remarks. I referred the hon. member for Essex West