

implement the necessary steps recommended by the task force.

I received a copy of a communication forwarded to the Minister of Transport, the hon. Paul Hellyer, by the Age and Opportunity Centre, Inc. of Winnipeg. This document is dated April 17, 1969. Let me read a couple of these paragraphs to dispel the complacency of the Prime Minister in respect of what the government is doing. The first paragraph reads:

The most glaring omission in the report of the task force on housing is that it ignores the need by those earning under \$5,500/year for housing, which, at present, they can neither afford to rent nor buy. Since more than half of the elderly in Canada fall into this category, this is doubly unfortunate. Provision must, therefore, be made to include legislation which will allow this large segment of our population to live in decent accommodation.

Having turned down the Minister of Transport, what chance is there that the government will agree to that kind of suggestion? The brief then states:

The report makes no mention and no provision for supplying funds at a reasonable cost for the preservation and rehabilitation of deteriorating housing stock. Many old homeowners find themselves unable to live on reduced incomes, pay higher taxes, and keep their homes in a state of repair.

The brief then states, at page two:

The National Housing Act should be broadened to make mortgage funds more readily available for the building of apartment or hostel accommodation for the elderly, whether it is being financed by a profit or non-profit corporation... Since high interest rates directly affect rent structure, everything must be done to keep the interest rates low.

My colleague, the hon. member for Broadview, indicated that our party believes the interest rate should be fixed at six per cent. The Prime Minister said two days ago during an interview with a writer from the *Toronto Telegram* that there was no money for new programs unless old programs could be liquidated. He is not likely to adopt a policy of subsidized rent.

Let us look at what some of the experts said about the task force recommendations. Michael Wheeler, who is the housing expert for the Canadian Welfare Council, said, as reported in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of January 31, 1969 in reference to task force recommendations:

The critical flaw in the report is that it would halt those measures that now offer some hope to low income groups without offering anything definite in their place except pious suggestions for further research and study.

### Housing

Later in the article it is stated:

The welfare council had called in an earlier policy statement for expansion of Canada's public housing program "as the most direct means of helping those in the worst housing conditions. The council also urged policies to avoid the stigma attached to public housing, including "a general housing allowance" for low income families to rent or buy homes.

There is nothing of that kind in the government's program.

Let me refer to what Leon Kumove, head of Toronto's social and community planning services, said about the task force report:

It made far too many generalizations about the nature of public housing. Some of it is bad, but some of it is also good. You must change public housing, you cannot eliminate it. The report is superficial.

This is from the *Globe and Mail* of January 3, 1969. The article then states:

Humphrey Carver, former chairman of Central Mortgage and Housing Corp.'s advisory group, said not one of the seven task force members had any previous knowledge of public housing or urban renewal.

"These are two of the most difficult subjects. The task force was battled by the problems it encountered, said it didn't like the whole idea of public housing and recommended it to be virtually stopped. This is an elementary attitude to take and it has done great damage to the whole cause of getting housing for low income families. Because of that report, a lot of people will go without proper housing".

● (6:30 p.m.)

Mr. Carver was right, because we had had a freeze by this government on the approval of public housing projects. A number of speakers from all parties have already mentioned that of the total number of housing units built in this country since the end of world war II, less than 1 per cent have been of the public housing type. Yet the government has seen fit to freeze the approval of any new public housing projects. I have spoken before, as have other hon. members, about public housing. There is a great deal wrong with public housing.

If you come to my city, in the corner of the constituency represented by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), you will see a new public housing project. I do not know who drew the plans. It certainly was not somebody from Winnipeg. They must have been drawn here in the maze of the bureaucracy of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. There are brick fences around that project, and a person going by it