

*The Address—Mr. Fleming*

I see I have only three or four minutes of time left, so I shall devote it to the subject of housing. Again, housing is the neglected child on the doorstep of the government, despite all the promises on which the government was elected in connection with housing, and all the glorious things it has been telling the Canadian people for the last several years. Despite all this the housing situation today is as bad as ever it was.

May I remind the house what the ever-optimistic minister, the then minister of reconstruction and supply, and now Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) said in the house on July 22, 1946, as reported at page 3672 of *Hansard*:

As at March, 1946, our minimum immediate housing needs were estimated at 150,000 housing units.

Then he went on to describe that as the emergent requirement. I asked him about it a year or two later, but he had forgotten all about it—which proves conclusively that he was reading somebody else's speech on that occasion. Then, in the city of Toronto only last week, the president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Mr. Mansur, in a speech to the Canadian construction association, had this to say:

The number of household groups including not only families but also individuals who maintain households, exceeds the number of front doors by approximately 350,000.

Then he goes on to say, in terms of emergency—

It would be my guess that the immediate need is of the order of 150,000 units.

That shows, Mr. Speaker, that the housing shortage is just as bad today as it was three years ago. That indicates the measure of the government's progress in the field of housing—after all their promises, after all the nonsense they have told us in this House of Commons about the progress they were making in housing. The fact of the matter is that the housing crisis in Canada today is as bad as it was three years ago. Their progress has been exactly nil.

In conclusion may I say we are dealing with a motion by my leader expressing want of confidence in this government. We see a government that has attempted to rip up the Canadian constitution, which has neglected defence, and admits now the critical danger which this country faces because of its neglecting defence; which has made inroads upon the freedoms and responsibilities of parliament; which has imposed a crushing burden of taxation; which has been practising extravagance on a profligate scale, as evidenced in the report made to the house the day before yesterday showing that one Toronto lawyer in the last two years has been paid \$172,000 in fees.

I say to you that this government does not possess the confidence of the country, and that the government does not deserve the confidence of this House of Commons.

**Mr. F. S. Zaplitny (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, one of the terms which has come up regularly in this debate has been a reference to national unity, and I should like to make that the theme of my remarks this afternoon.

There is no doubt in my mind that all members of parliament, regardless of their political complexions, are interested in and desirous that there shall be national unity in this country. I believe we are fortunate in that we have one of the most wonderful countries in the world. We are the inheritors of a great tradition and of great natural resources. National disunity could be a most serious instrument in destroying much that has been done. However, I say with all sincerity that I am very doubtful if the speeches thus far made on the question of dominion-provincial relations, the subject which has occupied the time of most speakers from the government and official opposition groups, have helped in any way to create national unity in this country.

The speeches I have heard thus far consisted of accusations, counter-accusations, acrimony, recrimination and explanation. There was a political high wind blowing. Somehow through all these verbal acrobatics the speakers have managed to keep their eyes cocked toward the province of Quebec.

I am sure that if we desire national unity in this country it can be achieved, but it can be achieved only by this parliament setting its eyes resolutely to the future and being prepared to forget much of what has taken place and by striving to prepare and carve out a program of economic and social security. In addition, and perhaps even of more importance, there should be the greatest possible equality of opportunity in the future for all the people of Canada rather than privileges for the few. If we will do that, I think much more will be achieved in the way of national unity than by all this wrangling which has so far taken place.

The speaker who preceded me referred to the welter of confusion in connection with dominion-provincial relations. I would be happy if I could stand up and say that his speech had cleared up that confusion. However, much as I would like to pay him that compliment, I am not able to do so because his words have only added to the welter of confusion so far as I have been able to understand them. He merely went over the ground that has been gone over so often. I sincerely hope that for the time being, at least until