

is restricted to one locality. The act was passed in 1954 under the former Government and due credit should be given to it for this initiative. The present Government wants to pursue this wise course. This act is a social security measure. What the population needs most in the way of social security—I have repeated it many times—is family security, a roof over the family's head. And when a man buys a piece of land to build himself a house, and thus becomes an owner, that little piece of his native land becomes all his own, and his love for his country grows deeper. At present, the main problem is that building costs are too high for the wage earner in the \$3,500 bracket. According to the latest statistics, the average family income is barely more than that. In the case of a loan for a \$10,000 house repayable in 25 years, at 6 per cent interest, repayment is at the rate of \$64 a month, plus insurance, maintenance and taxes, which add another \$20 at least, or a total of \$84 a month. Well, the man who earns only \$70 a week can hardly pay \$84 per month. That is the problem. The Quebec Government allows the owner of a new home costing up to \$8,000 a rebate on the interest charges amounting to 3 per cent of the amount of the loan. Thanks to this financial help, the wage earner in the \$3,500-\$3,800 bracket can manage to balance his budget. Economists say, and experience has shown, that you should not spend on housing per month more than you earn in one week. In our credit union housing loans, we provide for the continuity of the loan, so that even if the head of the family passes on, the family need not lose its home overnight. In the event of death, the balance of the loan is paid by the insurance. Some may think that this 2 or 3 per cent interest payment may be too heavy a charge on the Government. In theory, it may represent a little over \$2,000 for an \$8,000 loan. But statistics show that nearly 25 per cent of the beneficiaries of 25-year loans die before complete repayment. In those cases the insurance takes over and there is no more interest to be paid or guarantee to be given. The premium for this type of insurance comes to 5 cents per month per \$100, but it is reduced with every \$100 repaid. Thus, people of small means are enabled to have their own home. I make these few suggestions for the benefit of the proper authorities. Larger corporations refuse to venture in the smaller centres, where the insurance companies have no inspectors. They

want to lend where they can easily look after their investment. The Credit Unions, on the other hand, cover about all types of centres. We have granted loans to people in the Magdalen Islands, and we have had no trouble. Repayments are being made there as well as, if not better than, elsewhere, for as we have local branches there, supervision is greatly facilitated. As I said a few moments ago, we have developed this lending system. Credit Unions have over \$225 million in outstanding loans, and they have loaned a total of one billion dollars in the last 25 years. If we have succeeded, it is because we have discarded the system of repayments on a yearly basis, which did not work out very well, in favour of a monthly repayment plan. It is the most economical and social way to help our lower income groups to buy their own home and to ensure their happiness.

(Text):

**Hon. Thomas Reid:** When the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) speaks, will he answer two questions in addition to those which have already been propounded to him? Before putting those questions, may I say that although in principle the bill before us is the same as that which was introduced by the previous Government, it would seem to embody certain changes of policy. I noticed that when, this year, the minister was explaining this bill in the other place, he pointed out that stress is placed on the loaning of money for the building of homes, and that a prime purpose of the bill is to provide employment and work,—objects with which all of us are in agreement. But I would like to know why there seems to be discrimination now against the building of properties consisting of apartments which would be available for rent to persons who, for one reason or other, may have been forced to sell their homes. I have in mind particularly people up in years who, owing to higher assessments and increased municipal taxes, find it now almost impossible to carry on their old homes and are looking for apartments to rent. I know that in the district from which I come rental homes for the aged are becoming extremely common. At this point I would like to correct a statement made by a C.C.F. member in the other house who, repeating a statement made years ago when wartime houses were being built, said that these houses would one day bring about slum conditions. I have always maintained that that view was entirely wrong.