

when there is only one room in which to cook, eat and sleep. The other day in Ottawa a young woman with a beautiful child five years of age was asked by a friend if she did not wish she had another baby. She said, "There is certainly no use thinking about another baby with the housing situation as it is in Ottawa." This condition is affecting our birth rate. I do not wish to become a crank about this matter, but it should be recognized that this nation is in a contest for survival, and its survival may well depend upon the number of children that are born and raised within the next twenty years. We cannot afford to permit any condition which tends to decrease our birth rate.

As has been brought out by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell), the conditions under which many of our people are living are such as to destroy their emotional and moral health. Emotional and moral health are two things we simply cannot afford to sacrifice. Far too many of the toilers and the taxpayers of tomorrow—I hope this can be understood by the government—apparently they understand only things that work out to dollars and cents—far too many of the toilers and the taxpayers of tomorrow, and far too many of the fighters of the future cannot now find where to shelter their infant heads throughout Canada; nor have the children wholesome places where they can play while growing up.

The housing shortage is even deterring people from marrying.

What can be done about it? I have very little use for the person who complains of a condition without offering some constructive proposal. I submit what seems to me to be a proposal worthy of consideration at this time. In the first place the minister simply must use subsidies. Next he must stay on the job until the housing battle in Canada is won.

Mr. BENTLEY: We do not want him that long, do we?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I think he is as good a man as we can find anywhere. But someone is standing in his way. I understand that one prominent member of the administration has said that he would not continue to be a member of it if subsidies were used for housing. I suggest to the cabinet that unless they can change that man's mind the sooner they get rid of him the better. If we have to decide between a certain minister in the cabinet and decent housing in Canada, it should not take very long to decide between them.

The minister longs for private enterprise to fill the gap. May I point out that the govern-

ment through its policy for the last twenty years—not only this government but every government in the dominion—has utterly destroyed any hope of success for private enterprise. After all, any social agency must have conditions in which to work which will not render its success impossible. The present financial arrangements do render it utterly impossible for private enterprise to succeed in providing housing.

The government insists on using only debt finance to run the business of this country, federal, provincial and municipal; consequently every bit of money has to be raised by taxation. The provincial sources of revenue are altogether too meagre for the heavy responsibilities the provinces have to bear, and the municipalities are placed in the worst position of all because their only source of revenue is taxation upon real estate. What does this mean? It means that the better the house a company or private individual builds, the more taxation he has to pay in the community, and if the taxes continue heavy when he is unable to derive a revenue sufficient to meet them, he loses ownership of the property. This has happened throughout Canada.

I am reliably informed that in the nineteen thirties fifty per cent of the properties in Edmonton became city property against the will of the city of Edmonton itself, simply because the people who owned them were unable to pay the taxes. Who with the money to invest would put his money into houses and run the risk of having that condition duplicated against him in the next ten years? It is a matter of plain common sense. How can you expect men with money to put their money into houses after you have treated them in that way?

There was some hope when the war broke out that private enterprise in housing, having suffered terrible losses during the depression, might be able to recoup its losses. But what happened? In came wartime controls, rental controls, and control of every other aspect of housing, thus preventing those who had sustained losses in the depression from recouping. The result is that they are out even in wartime. I am not saying that controls were not necessary in the interests of our citizenry; I merely point out what occurred. In addition, if a man happened to make any money he was a victim of the income tax collector. Moreover we have exceedingly high building costs and a wide variety of restrictions on builders, restrictions for sanitary reasons, for fire protection, for the