

## National Housing Act

and a piece of land have been able to get it. However, it does say this:

About 70 per cent of new housing has been in the form of home ownership.

The minister should have gone on to say that more than 70 per cent of the people in Canada will never have a chance to own a piece of land or a home of their own unless we have some drastic changes in the housing legislation which the minister is bringing forward.

In the bureau of statistics publication entitled "Distribution of non-farm incomes", I find that 17.2 per cent of Canadian families receive over \$5,000. We have 15 per cent who get less than \$1,500 a year, 34 per cent who get under \$2,500 and 47 per cent who get under \$3,000. Hence we have altogether about 83 per cent of the people in Canada who fall below the \$5,000 per year which the minister will agree one should have if one is to embark on getting a piece of land at the fantastic prices being asked now and building a modern home. All across the country we find that the situation is the same. The Flin Flon *Daily Miner* came to my desk while I was awaiting my turn to speak. In it I find a dispatch from Cranberry Portage which reads in part as follows:

—housing is at a premium, yet people are living in places that have at one time been condemned, or should be condemned.

Diphtheria broke out here last fall—now it's T.B. Since school began last September, it's been one thing after another . . .

What is worrying many is the number of places being lived in that have or should be condemned. A prominent citizen of the community told of a "shack" as he described it being condemned a few years ago by a police magistrate in the company of a health nurse. It was reoccupied three days after the order and has been ever since.

I realize that the 17 per cent of the Canadian people are able to look forward to having a piece of land and a new house. I am told by some of my colleagues that Vancouver is the finest place in the world in which to live, that housing costs are low there because lumber is so cheap and it is not necessary to insulate as it is in other parts of the country. In Tuesday's *Vancouver Sun* I find that you can get a new N.H.A. home there with three bedrooms for \$16,500. Here is a snap. You can get this property for \$9,100. Here is another one, with five rooms, at \$13,500. This one is described as being spectacular. This home has everything, completely modern, five-room, and it is going for only \$10,500. Here is another new N.H.A. home at \$13,900; and so it goes on down the list. There are almost two pages devoted to these houses for sale in the *Vancouver Sun*, and which cost \$12,000 or \$15,000, or more.

67509—211½

They are being occupied by the 17 per cent of the people who are getting \$5,000 or more.

I find that there are other conditions in Canada. I happened to run across a copy of the *Toronto Daily Star* last fall. This is dated Saturday, November 19. I tore out this sheet. In it there are two good housing stories. One is by Robert Nielsen. It is headed "Real dividends of housing are happier human beings". I might say what is well known, namely that this paper is famous for supporting the present government on every possible pretext, but sometimes some things are written that are slightly embarrassing. This article reads as follows:

Few large cities in North America have built so little public housing as Toronto, which can show only the 1,289 units of Regent Park North completed to date. In this respect Toronto is typical of Canada as a whole, for there are scarcely 4,000 units of public housing in the dominion. One major reason is ideological: Public housing is often denounced as "socialistic".

I suppose that is the minister's way out. The article continues:

It is therefore something of a paradox that the United States, more hostile to socialism, more committed to private enterprise than perhaps any nation on earth, has a history of 18 years of federal aid to public housing, during which some 300,000 subsidized units have been built.

The minister simply cannot argue that Canada has a good record. If you multiply the 4,000 built in Canada by 15 you get 60,000, so that compared with 300,000 they have five times as many low-rental subsidized housing units in the United States, by population, as we have in Canada.

Then here is another story by Monroe Johnston on the same page. It says:

At least 8,000 Toronto families are doomed to live in blighted or slum housing unless metro Toronto awakes to the need for more low-cost rental housing.

These 8,000 families have signed their names to the waiting list for Regent Park North, Toronto's one and only public housing development.

Later on it points out that the Regent Park development, which was started more than 10 years ago, is a show place. Previously this was one of the most blighted areas in Toronto. The people in the area were paying \$36,000 in taxes. They are now paying in taxes \$240,000, and in addition to paying all operating expenses and taxes they have repaid over \$200,000 toward the capital cost.

When I spoke the other night I referred to the article entitled "Fourteen Days as an Old Age Pensioner," by William MacEachern. I did not explain that he is a fine looking young chap who appears to be in his early twenties, who spent 14 days trying to find out how old age pensioners live. He budgeted \$20 for two weeks. Some hon. members have asked me about this article, and I am sure the Toronto