

American association of university women, the American council on education, the home economics association, the American veterans committee, the association of Jewish centre workers, the national conference of Catholic charities, the congress of parents and teachers, and so on. Right Reverend Monsignor O'Grady pointed out the general principles that these representative American organizations thought should be fundamental in carrying out a housing program. He said:

Implicit in any national housing objective is the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. As a corollary but equally important goal is the development of a stable and health home building industry which can make its full contribution toward a prosperous economy of maximum and sustained production and employment.

There should be a national housing policy—established by the congress—which sets as a fundamental objective the realization, as soon as feasible, of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, which calls for every feasible aid to enable private enterprise to meet more of the total housing need, and which clearly recognizes the necessity for federal assistance for the special problem areas of slum clearance and the provision of adequate low rent public housing for families with incomes so low that they cannot otherwise be decently housed in new or existing private housing.

In bringing down their specific program they called for housing research; for incentives and aids directly related to the construction process; for home ownership generally; for home ownership through non-profit co-operative housing; for central housing; for low rental housing; and they state again the obvious fact which has been recognized long before this in Canada:

The stark fact is that, despite years of congressional and other investigation, there still has been advanced no alternative program that will provide decent housing within the means of our lowest income families. There must be an unhesitating and unequivocal rejection of any housing program that will provide aid for all except those who need aid the most. Accordingly, there must be an extension of the present low rent housing program with such modifications as are necessary to adapt the program to current cost and related conditions.

Then they emphasize the need for slum clearance and urban re-development, for housing for veterans, and for farm and rural housing. If the minister will not act on the suggestions which have come from this section of the house, I would urge him to act on the suggestions coming from the annual meeting of the construction association of Canada and the opinions expressed in Washington before the senate banking and currency committee on behalf of so many representative organizations.

I had planned on making reference to two of the public housing developments I visited in the United States some time ago, those in New Haven and the East river district of New York city, but time will not permit me to say more than that the rents charged in these low-cost, subsidized housing projects were at a minimum rate of \$15.50 per month up to a maximum rate of \$19.50. The houses are all fireproof, well constructed, with frigidaires, electric lights and so on. Every unit gets sunlight at some time of the day. They are well ventilated, and playgrounds are available to the children. Compare the condition in New Haven and New York with the capital city of Canada, for example. The federal government has made available to the city of Ottawa a number of buildings. The leader of this group and a number of other interested citizens visited Wallis house, one of these housing units, and the story certainly is not one of which members of parliament or Canadians generally can be proud. The group included the leader of this party, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), Donald C. MacDonald, president of the Ottawa East C.C.F. club; Pat Conroy, Doris French and Allan O'Brien, members of the Ottawa East club, and J. E. McGuire, member of the Ottawa West club. They found conditions to be shocking.

Mr. HOWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has nothing whatever to do with the operation of Wallis house, and I suggest that any discussion of that matter is entirely out of order.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I made it clear that these buildings are not being operated by the federal government.

Mr. HOWE: Then what has the subject to do with this bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I mentioned that the federal government made the buildings available to the city of Ottawa. These buildings are used to house some of Canada's veterans and other Canadians who have come to Ottawa, and the federal government cannot say it has no responsibility for housing in this federal area.

Mr. HOWE: I do say so, and I press my point of order. My hon. friend is discussing a matter of housing in which the federal government has no participation whatever. It made the building available to the city. The building is a good building. How the city treated it has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. MacINNIS: We are dealing with a housing bill, and although it may not come under this particular measure, we have to have