

and 100,000 a year thereafter. What are the facts? The facts are that we completed 50,000 housing units in 1945 and 60,000 in 1946, and we plan for 80,000 in 1947. We believe that we can reach that objective.

I ask hon. members: where will you find, in any other country, a record that will compare with that? I happened to notice, as other hon. members probably did, that recently the mayor of this city of Ottawa attended a meeting of mayors of municipalities in the United States. Among the matters discussed there was the all-important item of housing.

The mayor returned to this city and gave an interview to the press, which is reported in the *Evening Journal* of January 27. This is what the *Journal* records:

Housing in United States cities was the number one headache on the agenda of the American Federation of Mayors, according to Mayor Lewis who has returned from a week's visit to Washington where the body met.

Mayor O'Dwyer of New York told the federation that his city alone needed 750,000 new apartments. No solution of the housing problem in the United States seemed in sight.

That is the statement given by the mayor of this capital city, given after attending a conference at which municipalities throughout the United States were represented.

Hon. members know that the same is true in the United Kingdom and in other countries. There is an appalling shortage of houses everywhere. They also know that many of the materials required for the building of houses, so as to make them habitable, cannot be produced at will or found in a short time.

Certainly there is a housing problem in Canada. But I venture to say that problem in this country is cared for better than it has been in any other country. I could give other citations to indicate how the situation has progressed. I have quoted from the *Journal* and, so as to be quite impartial, I shall quote from the *Ottawa Citizen* the following statement in regard to the records broken by 1946 building. These records are from the bureau of statistics, and as such I believe they can be taken as authentic. The *Citizen* states:

Canada's building industry moved ahead in 1946 at the greatest rate in history, breaking previous records by more than \$100,000,000.

The bureau of statistics reported Monday preliminary returns from 204 municipalities showed an aggregate value for the year of \$382,028,707 in building permits. This compared with \$197,187,160 in 1945, \$60,272,379 in 1939 and \$234,944,549 in the previous record year of 1929.

The municipalities issued permits for the construction of 43,628 new dwelling units during the year compared with 28,569 in 1945. The 1946 permits included 39,999 for new buildings and 3,629 for conversions.

I say to my hon. friends opposite that they would be fairer—I will not say to the government, but certainly to the country—if they were to give the country the benefit of these facts which indicate just how far this country is in the lead of other countries in meeting this, perhaps the most difficult, of all situations of immediate interest.

Mr. COCKERAM: Are those buildings or permits?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member will have to read what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. An hon. member who has the floor ought not to be interrupted without obtaining his permission.

Mr. COCKERAM: I should like to know whether it is buildings or permits.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should ask permission if he wishes to interrupt.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like now to come to the question of dominion-provincial fiscal arrangements, the tax agreements. In doing so I shall not attempt to answer all particulars. I may say to my hon. friend, if he will permit me to say so, that I think it is well for a leader to leave some things to his followers, and not to try to take up everything himself.

I know of course that that has been a failing of hon. leaders of the official opposition, because I have sat here a long time and have seen leader after leader opposite attempt to monopolize all points in debate. I hope I have given hon. leaders opposite an example by allowing my colleagues to have their say in debate and in discussing the different questions which may arise. In respect of taxation, and like matters, there are hon. gentlemen on either side of me who are entitled to be heard, and who will be able to answer my hon. friend most effectively.

But on this question of the tax agreements—

Mr. BRACKEN: The right hon. gentleman has spoken for more than four hours in this house, and I have not yet come up to that record.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And I say to my hon. friend that it all depends upon what one says in that time. I say to him further that if he were to speak for four weeks like he did this afternoon confusion at the last would be even more confounded than it was at the first.

My hon. friend this afternoon drew attention to the length of time that this parliament and the provinces have been discussing