

National Defence Act

other incidents that occurred while I was serving in the forces where I thought an appeal against the court-martial in question would have been justified and in the interests of justice.

Mr. Pearkes: Just before the resolution carries, if it is of any interest to hon. members I can advise them of the change of name provided they will pardon my atrocious French pronunciation. The present French name for the air force is Corps d'Aviation Royal Canadien. That name indicates that it is a corps, a corps being a subordinate part of an army formation. This name has caused confusion, particularly in European countries such as France and Germany where our air division is serving. The suggested name, Forces Aériennes Royales du Canada, removes that objection.

Mr. Chevrier: May I ask the minister a question. I presume that this amendment will be contained in the bill that will be brought before the house in due course.

Mr. Pearkes: Yes. As I indicated last night, this is one of the amendments to the National Defence Act which we are introducing in the bill.

Mr. Chevrier: Is the new name a matter of translation only?

Mr. Pearkes: It is a matter of translation only.

Mr. Chevrier: Then may I bring this to the minister's attention. Of course I am not a translator and am not versed in niceties of translation, but it would strike me that the translation puts an entirely different aspect upon the name in French than was the case before. The name Corps d'Aviation Royal Canadien, which to me places the emphasis on Canada, becomes Forces Aériennes Royales du Canada, which places the emphasis on "Royal". Has the minister any comment to make on that?

Mr. Pearkes: I think we had better discuss that when the bill is before the house.

Mr. Herridge: Before the resolution passes I must compliment the minister on his bilingualism.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Pearkes thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-27, to amend the National Defence Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. Herridge.]

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT**AMENDMENT INCREASING AGGREGATE AMOUNT AVAILABLE, ETC.**

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 4, consideration in committee of the following resolution—Mr. Green—Mr. Seigny in the chair:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the National Housing Act, 1954, to increase from seven hundred and fifty million dollars to one billion dollars the aggregate amount that may be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund under subsection 1 of section 22 of the act, and to remove the limitation on the amount thereof that may be advanced to the corporation for the purposes of subsection 1 of section 11 of the said act, and to provide further for certain changes in connection with the administration of the act.

Mr. Howard: I should like to make a comment or two on this subject, sir, with reference to a group of people in a specific wage bracket, that is those who earn less than \$3,000 a year. This matter has been dealt with to some extent by the minister in his opening remarks and slightly by other hon. members.

Before proceeding with my argument I think it would be well to lay the groundwork for it by a reference to the effect of the government's housing policy in connection with the low wage group by making a reference to the twelfth annual report for 1957 of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. On page 10 this report indicates that a large proportion of the houses built under the act were in the range of \$14,000 to \$18,000, and that the average annual income of the borrowers was about \$5,800. We can see, therefore, that the great proportion of the houses that have been built cost from \$14,000 to \$18,000 and that the average income of the borrower was \$5,800.

A large proportion of our population falls in the income group of less than \$3,000. The latest statistical information I have been able to get on this subject comes from the taxation statistics for 1957, which indicate that 62 per cent or almost two-thirds of our total working force in Canada earn less than \$3,000. We are entitled therefore, I feel, to make some specific inquiries of the minister and make some suggestions to him.

Mr. Green: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question. Has he not noticed that the figures he gave refer to houses financed prior to the middle of 1957, which would be under the insurance provision and not under the small home loans policy at all?

Mr. Howard: Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to make comments in that direction later, as well as on the other phases of the minister's remarks.