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## INTRODUCTION

THE HOUSING PROBIEM

The Housing Problem is directly traceable to the Industrial Revolution of the 19th Century. With the advent of the machine and the large-scale factory there was attracted to the cities a concentration of population and a consequent urban growth unparallelled in history.

The rise in the cost of living which followed this development was accompanied by a relatively proportionate increase in wages. This increase in wages, however, though tending to establish an equilibrium with the general cost of living, has never been sufficient to permit the low-wage group to command adequate housing accommodation. The reason for this anomaly can be attributed to several factors.

First, the newer methods of industrial production have been only partially adaptable to the construction industry. Construction still renains a dominantly manual enterprise rather than a machine industry. Lacking the econony of mass production or factory assembly, housing costs are disproportionate in compari son with other types of production.

Second, land values have responded to a speculative market thus adding to the inflationary cost of housing.

Third, the relatively high cost of building money has added a further burden to on industry which, by its very nature, must always proceed by borrowing over extended periods.

As a consequence, the over-all costs of construction (labour, material, land and interest) make it difficult, if not impossible, to produce housing winich will pay an economic rent, conform to minimum standards of acceptance, and still be within the ability of the low-wage worker to afford.

While this condition affects more or less all wage-workers, it is most acutely felt by the lower of the low-wage brackets. These people whose employment is frequently only of a seasonal nature, or whose total annual wage is of meagre proportions, must
obtain their shelter requirements from wherever it is available at the cheapest rents offered. In practise this means old and inferior housing, abandoned by the more comfortable classes and which, being heavily depreciated in value, requires but a nominal rent income in order to justify its carrying costs. Nuch of this housing is wholly unsatisfactory for human habitation.

In 1931, according to Federal statistics, 60 percent of the male wageworkers in Caneda received less than $\$ 1000$ per annum; and the average wage was $\$ 927$. If the average was $\$ 927$ it is obvious that many thousands of Canadian workers were in receipt of wages well below this figure. Among economists and other authorities it is generelly rocognized that rents for the low-wage workers should not exceed from 20 to 25 percent of their income. On this basis the average group in receipt of $\$ 927$ should be paying rents not in excess of $\$ 185$ to $\$ 232$ per annum; or $\$ 15$ to $\$ 19$ per monthi But there are many wage-workers whose total annual income does not permit their paying in excess of from $\$ 10$ to $\$ 12$ per month for their shelter requirements. And, as we have pointed out, private capital is unable to provide housing of an acceptable minimum standard at these rates which will produce an economic rent.

This problem first became apparent in the cities of Europe where the modern industrial system had its beginnings. The social phenomena being interdependent, it was soon realized that lad housing had grape repercussions on the health and morality of its occupants, as well as on the general communty, Ill-health, disease, infant and premature adult mortality, as well as a growth in the incidence of juvenile and adult crime, along with a general lousening of the moral standards, early revealed themselves in disproportionate degree among the ill-housed families. Nor was it long before it was recognized that these conditions meant important economic losses and increased public expenditures to the comunity at large; notably with regard to the cost of hospitalization, social services, police and fire protection.

But if the same causes universally result in the same effects, it must be expected that in different cities wide and significant variations will be found. Each city has its own peculiar characteristics which serve to modify or emphasize the
general rule. Differing building regulations, social customs, land usage, methods of supervision, and other factors make the housing problen in each individual city that much different from conditions prevailing elsewhere. Consequently, each city must be studied separately in order to appreciate its peculiar indigenous nature.

Likewise in applying a renedy to improve the condition. What is applicable in one city may not be applicable in anothor. So that, while we can always profit in some measure from the experience elsewhere, it is not only undesirable but obviously impossible to wholly conform either to the pattern or the concept evolved to fit other needs.

In recent years the housing problen in Montreal has been the subject of several interesting studies. Among others $1^{\circ}$ La Petito Propriété Urbaine, by Arthur St-Pierre, published in the proccedings of La Somaine Sociale, 1924; $2^{\circ}$ A Report on Housing and Slum Clearance for Montreal, published by the Board of Trade and the City Improvement League, 1935; $3^{\circ}$ Housing for the Low-wage Earner, published by the Montreal Council of Social Agencies, 1936.

These studies have thrown considerable light on the problem. But each of them was lacking in detailed and precise information on certain important aspects of Montreal's housing conditions. In an effort to supplement and fill in the gaps in such studios, the Department of Planning and Research of the Montreal Metropolitan Comisission has, during 1937, undertaken two important surveys. Working in cooperation with the Department of Health of the City of Montreal, a group of investigators visited in the month of January, 1937, approximately 1400 dwellings situated in 15 wards of the city. The facts gathered from this survey and the conclusions derived therefrom form the basis of a report published in the early spring under the title " 376 DWELLINGS IN MONITREAL AND VERDUN".

A further survey was conducted during the surmer of 1937. It covered 60 blocks situated in 7 wards of the east and west sections of the city, where there is found a considerable portion of old housing. The investigators visited each house, old and
new, situated in these blocks, so that a complete study of these areas was made, pormitting a satisfactory appreciation of average conditions. The dwellings visited totalled 4,216, which, with the number visited earlier in the year, brings the total to 5,592 dwellings surveyed by the Department.

The housing problem presents itself in two forms - the problem of quality and the problen of quantity. This report is therefore divided into two parts, corresponding to these two aspects of the problem.

One finds in the first section the statistical results of the study undertaken during the sumer of 1937, and in the second section a detailed enalysis showing the volume of housing construction and the general population growth of Montreal during the last twelve years.

STMMER SURVEI, 1937

ORGANIZATION

1. The survey was undertaken during the period June 21st to August 14th. Some sections of the statistical data resulting from the survey were compiled concurrently. Others followed the conclusion of the field work. The detailed analysis and interpretation of the facts revealed from the statistics have necessarily entailed a longer period of preparation, and have only recently been completed.
2. Fourteen investigators were ongaged on this survey. Ten of these were students from the Ecole Polytechnique, l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Comerciales and the University of Montreal; and four were graduate students of McGill University. They were divided into three groups each under the direction of a supervisor, who had had previous experience in the survey conducted earlier in the year.
3. The Department of Health of Nontreal placed at our disposal one of its inspectors, in order to facilitate investigation of the houses and to intervene if necessary. In this latter respect we are pleased to report that our investigating staff was given a uniformly gracious reception, and obtained generous cooperation from the households visited.
A. The Department has also prepared plans showing the existing land usage of every block surveyed.
4. All the relevant information on the physical structure of the dwellings visited, on their surroundings, and on the economic and social conditions of the occupants have been entered on forms which are on file in the Department. This information is supplemented by personal observations noted by the investigators, dealing with data which is difficult to record statistically.
5. After preliminary study of plans and information furnished by the Department of Health of Montreal, a visit to 15 wards where the greater part of the older housing of Montreal is found, resulted in the isolation for investigation of 60 blocks in 7 wards, based on their general outward appearance.
6. With few exceptions these blocks were chosen from within those zones reserved for residential purposes by the Montreal Town Planning Comission. An effort was made to study blocks adjoining one another, in order to arrive at a better appreciation of average conditions.

## SITUATION OF DWELLINGS

8. The blocks and dwellings visited were situated in 7 wards in the east and west end of the city. The following table gives the distribution.

| EAST | Totel Number <br> of Dwellings | Number of Dwellings <br> Visited | Number of <br> Blocks Visited |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Bourget | 5498 | 1196 | 15 |
| Papineau | 3307 | 697 | 17 |
| St. James | 5027 | 727 | 7 |
| Ville Marie | 1660 | 123 | 3 |
| Cremazie | 3246 | 86 | $1 *$ |

VEST

| St. Cunegonde | 4250 | 732 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| St. Henry | 6421 |  |  |
|  | 29409 | $\frac{655}{4216}$ | $\frac{9}{60}$ |

* This block was surveyed in order to complete certain information for the spring survey of 1937.


## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

9. The 4216 dwellings visited were inhabited by 18837 persons, occupying 18457 rooms, excluding the water closets and bathrooms. These figures show a density of population as followed:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0.98 \text { rooms per person } \\
& \text { 1.02 persons per room } \\
& 4.5 \text { persons per dwelling }
\end{aligned}
$$

10. The beds and other sleeping accommodation were sufficiont for 19089 persons.
11. The dwellings are occupied by French-Canadians in the proportion of 91 out of 100 , and by Catholics in the proportion of 95 out of 100.
12. Most of the dwellings consisted of 3,4 or 5 rooms and provided 2 or 3 bedrooms.
13. Only 190 dwellings were occupied by their owner.
14. The nature of the ownership of the property surveyed is as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { Privately owned } & 85 \% \\
\text { Estate Managed } & 11 \% \\
\text { Company owned } & 4 \%
\end{array}
$$

15. The length of resident in Montreal is recorded in 2527 cases as follows:

Less than 1 year 12
1 to 3 years 17
3 to 5 years 19
5 to 8 years 44
8 years or more 2435

## II. THE BUILDING

16. It is often difficult to determine the dividing structural wall separating contiguous houses. We have therefore made no attempt to establish the number of houses surveyed but only the number of dwellings.
17. Most of the blocks are composed of long rows of contiguous houses, each containing several flats. $82 \%$ of the facades are of brick, $8 \%$ of stone, $9 \%$ of wod, and $1 \%$ of other materials.
18. With reference to type of houses and number of storeys, the distribution is as follows:

## TYPE

Flats
Semi-detached houses
Detached houses Apartnent houses
96.8\% 1.1\% 1.0\% $1.1 \%$

NUMBER OF STOREYS

| One | $3.0 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Two | $35.2 \%$ |
| Three | $64.1 \%$ |
| Four | $0.4 \%$ |

19. In 495 cases the ground floor is utilized for commercial purposes, for the most part groceries and small restaurants. These were not visited, save in cases where they also served as dwellings.
20. The state of the physical structure of the dwellings is indicated in the following table:
A. PHYSICAL CONDITION

| CONDITION |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { a } \\ & \text { İ } \\ & \text { - } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { 世 } \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 者 } \\ & \text { م } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very good | 270 | 126 | 116 | 110 | 267 | 304 | 168 | 212 | 286 | 673 |
| Good | 1444 | 788 | 528 | 793 | 1491 | 1463 | 838 | 1217 | 1517 | 1622 |
| Fair | 1965 | 776 | 722 | 801 | 1888 | 1862 | 1098 | 1205 | 1944 | 1568 |
| Bad | 461 | 170 | 229 | 117 | 492 | 527 | 272 | 245 | 421 | 312 |
| Not stated | 76 | 9 | 274* | 48 | 78 | 60 |  |  | 48 | 41 |
| Total | 4216 | 1869 | 1869 | 1869 | 4216 | 4216 |  |  | 4216 | 4216 |

It is interesting to compare the statistics relating to the "Fair"and "Bad" conditions:

21. Often the brick facade has been superimposed on an old original structure of wood. Many houses originally of wood have an exterior of stucco or brick later added. In such instances the exterior has an improved appearance, although the structure may still be in bad condition.
22. In a number of cases the front of the houses is well-kept, but the rear and the surrounding outhouses are in a state of extreme dilapidation.
23. The investigators noted during their examination of the properties a commendable attitude on the part of the tenants to keep their dwellings in a good state of repair. Unemployed tenants, provided with material by their landlords, do mach of this work themselves.
24. In the older houses the cellars are generally shallow and not utilized.
25. In $82 \%$ of the dwellings, the entrance was from the street; 272 had their entrance through a back yard or court, or through a covered passageway.
26. Rear-court dwellings surveyod total 379.
27. Among the out-buildings, apart from sheds, there are 200 private garages and 106 stables.
III. THE D WEILING
28. With reference to the number of storeys contained in each dwelling, the classification is as follows:

| 1 storey | 3567 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 storeys | 595 |
| 3 storeys | 7 |
| Not stated | 47 |
|  |  |

29. In $91.5 \%$ of the dwellings the floors were of soft wood.
30. 122 attics, 58 basements, and 13 cellars were found inhabited. (A cellar is defined as a room where less than half of its height is above the level of the soil.)
31. The arrangement of the dwellings with reference to the number of rooms and their use (excluding water clceets and bathrooms) is as follows:

Number of Rooms Usage of Rooms

| Dwellings of 1 room | 5 | Dwellings having a living-room | 2473 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2 rooms | 239 | Dwellings having a dining-room | 1578 |
| 3 rooms | 777 |  |  |
| 4 rooms | 1509 |  |  |
| 5 rooms | 844 |  |  |
|  | 6 rooms | 520 | Dwellings of 1 rooms |
|  | 7 rooms | 215 | 3 rooms |

(Typical plans of one-floor dwellings are shown in the appendix).
32. Many dwellings showed a marked dilapidation, which was generelly manifest throughout. The proportion of such cases, in relation to the total number of dwellings investigated, is shown in the following table:

| Walls | $10 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Ceilings | $12 \%$ |
| Floors | $19 \%$ |
| Doors and |  |
| windows | $5 \%$ |

33. Many tenants complain that the bad condition of the floors wears out the carpets and floor coverings.
34. Most of the dwellings are heated solely by means of a stove which serves also for cooking purposes.
35. The types of fuel used for cooking and its place of storage are shown in the following table:

| Types |  | Storage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coal | 697 | Shed | 3749 |
| Gas | 1412 | Cellar | 225 |
| Electricity | 83 | Kitchen | 16 |
| Oil | 209 | Other rooms | 4 |
| Wood | 3039 | Other places | 36 |
|  | 5440 |  | 4030 |

Some people use more then one type of fuel, and others use a common shed for storage. This accounts for the discrepancy in the above figures, with reference to the total number of dwellings visited. The use of oil for cooking is regarded as very economical by many householders.
36. There are 143 dwellings where the sane kitchen is used by more than one household.
37. In $67 \%$ of the dwellings refrigerators were used for food storage. These refrigerators are often of domestic fabrication, but are not always kept filled with ice. Larders only were found in $26 \%$ of the dwellings, and $7 \%$ of the households stored their food by other means.
38. More than $99 \%$ of the dwellings are lighted by electricity.

## SANITARY CONDITIONS

39. Only 1351 dwellings, $32 \%$, have a bathtub; these were generally of a modern type. In general, the older dwellings are without bathroom facilities.
40. There are 98 dwellings where the same bathroom serves more than one household.
41. Every dwolling has at least 1 00ld-water faucot; but only 465 ( $11 \%$ ) have hot-water plumbing.
42. There are 139 cases where the same tap serves more than one family.
43. All the dwellings are equipped with a water closet with direct sewer connections.
44. There are 134 cases where more than one household uses the same water closet.
45. In the older dwellings, in order to conform to the regulations of the Department of Health, water closets were installed years after the completion of the building. In these cases the water closet is located in one or other of the existing rooms, frequently without window space, but having a ventilator to the outside ai $r$. In the dwellings surveyed, the water closets were situated in the following places:

| Isolated | 1716 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Kitchen | 1431 |
| Living room | 112 |
| Bedroom | 536 |
| Cloakroom or hallway | 239 |
| Not reported | $\frac{182}{4216}$ |

46. The plumbing is ancient, but still in good condition, in $71 \%$ of the dwellings.
47. Natural ventilation is good in $92 \%$ of the rooms.
48. The dwellings visited had a total of 22,121 windows in 18,457 rooms, water closets and bathrooms excluded. Skylights placed directly above rooms are counted as windows.
49. The rooms indirectly lighted, that is to say, without windows but with a permanent opening from an adjoining room containing a window, totalled 1,641 , that is $9 \%$ of the total number of rooms.
50. "Dark rooms", that is rooms with neither window nor skylight and having a door which can be closed, number 17, of which 14 are occupied.
51. Natural lighting is good in $86 \%$ of the rooms.

- 52. The older houses are erected parallel to the street, rather than perpendicular to it, and on the width rather than the length of the lot, in contrast to the more recent types of tenement flats. The older dwellings, therefore, are, generally speaking, well lighted. It is notably in the newer dwellings that rooms with indirect lighting are found.

53. Hindrances to sunlight are shown in the following table:

| Narrow street | 18 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Adjoining house | 286 |
| Shed | 353 |
| Other | 56 |

54. It is evident from these figures that sheds are the most frequent and serious hindrance to sunlight. They are for the most part in a dilapidated condition and constitute a grave fire hazard. It has been noted that where old sheds have been demolished there has been a decided improvement both in the natural lighting and in the general environment.
55. On washdays, in districts where construction is congested it frequently happens that the washing hanging on the lines intercepts the sunlight in large measure.
56. 387 dwellings, $9.8 \%$ are subject to permanent dampness. 20 cases were found where the cellars were periodically flooded.
57. Many of these dwellings are infested with vermin, as indicated in the following table:

| Rats | 617 dwellings | $15 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bedbugs | 715 dwellings | $17 \%$ |
| Cockroaches | 989 dwellings | $23 \%$ |

The above conditions are to be expected in old houses which for the most part are of wood construction. The presence of rats is generally attributable to the existence of stables in the neighborhood.
58. Foul odours were noticed both outside and inside the dwellings in the proportion of $5 \%$ and $2 \%$ respectively.
59. The general state of cleanliness was found bad in $7.5 \%$ of the dwellings. Unhygienic conditions were noted for $11 \%$ of the water closets and $22 \%$ of the bathrooms. There are, however, few cases of extreme filth.
60. For the purpose of the survey, we adopted the following definitions for household and family: Household: Every person or group of persons, related or not, occupying a dwelling; Pemily: The father, the mother, and the children.

## OCCUPANIS

61. The 18,837 occupants of the 4,216 dwellings visited are classified according to their age and household group as follows:

Age of Occupants Household Group

| Infants of less than 3 years | 1230 | 1 person | 91 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children between 3 and 16 years | 5381 | 2 persons | 739 |
| Parents* | 8255 | 3 | 828 |
| Others+ | 3971 | 4 | 778 |
|  | 18837 | 5 | 565 |
|  |  | 6 | 430 |
| *Parents - Father and Mother. |  | 7 | 310 |
| +Others - Children more than |  | 8 | 183 |
| 16 years old, roomers and other |  | 9 | 110 |
| occupants. |  | 10 | 64 |
|  |  | 11 | 38 |
|  |  | 12 | 15 |
|  |  | 13 and more | 30 |
|  |  | Not stated | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |

62. 140 cases of overcrowding were noted.
63. There are 202 cases where persons of different sexes, other than husband and wife or young children, were sleeping in the same room.
64. 338 cases were noted where adults and children, small infants excepted, were sleeping in the same room.

INCCME
65. Records were obtained showing the weekly wage income of $2,885^{\circ}$ persons employed, out of a total of 3,930 , as follows:

| Wage | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { of persons } \end{aligned}$ | Grouping in Multiples of $\$_{10}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Wage | Persons | Percent |
| \$8 or less per week | 477 | Less than \$10 per week | 678 | 24\% |
| \% 8 to \$10 | 201 | Less than \$20 per week | 2238 | 78\% |
| \$10 to \$12 | 27. | Less than $\$ 30$ per week | 2762 | 96\% |
| \$12 to \$15 | 509 | Less than \$ $\$ 40$ per week | 2867 | 99\% |
| \$15 to \$18 | 560 | More than $\$ 40$ per week | + 18 |  |
| \$18 to \$20 | 212 | More than \$10 per week |  |  |
| \$20 to \$22 | 240 |  |  |  |
| \$22 to \$25 | 113 |  |  |  |
| \$25 to \$30 | 171 |  |  |  |
| \$30 to \$35 | 74 |  |  |  |
| \$35 to 40 | 31 |  |  |  |
| \% 40 and more | 18 |  |  |  |

66. Wages less than $\$ 10$ per week are earned, generally, by youths working in factories, stores, etc., or as messengers. Also, in many cases low wages, especially from $\$ 10$ to $\$ 12$, represent part-time work and not full weekly wages,
67. Tenants receiving direct relief number 1,143. of these, 831 were in receipt of full relief and 312 of partial relief.
68. 220 persons were in receipt of pensions.
69. Evidences of poverty were noted in more than a third of the dwellings visited to wit, 1579, and evidences of comfort in approximately the same proportion. RENTI
70. The monthly rental in 3886 cases is grouped as follows:
Up to \$16
2828 dwellings
$73 \%$
More than ${ }^{\text {W }} 16$
1058 dwellings
$27 \%$

A further breakdown of the above reveals the following:

| $\$ 8$ or less | 134 dwellings |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 8$ to $\$ 10$ | 309 |
| $\$ 10$ to $\$ 12$ | 800 |
| $\$ 12$ to $\$ 14$ | 770 |
| $\$ 14$ to $\$ 16$ | 815 |
| $\$ 16$ to $\$ 18$ | 399 |
| $\$ 18$ to $\$ 20$ | 306 |
| $\$ 20$ to $\$ 22$ | 191 |
| $\$ 22$ to $\$ 24$ | 63 |
| $\$ 24$ and mare | 99 |

71. The rent included heating in 50 cases; garage in 10 cases; water taxes
in 13; and other advantages in 26.
72. In 4,065 cases, a distribution of how the rent is paid is shown as follows:

| By the family | 2886 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Relief Commission | 1143 (in whole or part) |
| By parents or relatives | 20 |
| By Social Service | 16 |

73. The number of tenants not on relief but having rent arrears is 308 .

## IENGTH OF RESIDENCE AND NUMBER OF REMOVALS

74. The length of occupation of the dwelling by its present occupants was obtained for 4,092 cases, as follows:

| 1 year | 1940 | 1 year or less | $47 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 years | 571 | 2 years or less | $61 \%$ |
| 3 years | 426 | 3 years or less | $72 \%$ |
| 4 years | 232 | More than 3 years | $28 \%$ |
| 5 years | 157 |  |  |
| 6 years | 68 |  |  |
| 7 years | 90 |  |  |
| 8 years | 59 |  |  |
| 9 years | 46 |  |  |
| 10 years | 60 |  |  |
| 11 years and more $\frac{443}{}$ |  |  |  |

75. The reasons for their last removal were obtained from 2,195 tenants. They are classified as follows: physical conditions of the dwelling, $34 \%$; economic or social reasons, $32 \%$; hygienic conditions, $25 \%$; general unsatisfactory environment, $9 \%$. The following summary tabulates the more specific reasons:

General ondition of building and dwelling:

| Too small | 474 | Rent too high | 455 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Too large | 125 | In room before | 126 |
| General bad confition of dwelling | 47 | Newleywed | 38 |
| Vanted lower flat | 37 | In order to save money | 32 |
| Building demolished | 27 | Owing to commerce or other |  |
| Too old or dilapidated | 18 | occupation | 18 |
| Building situated in rear court | 8 | To take house of their own | 12 |
| Dangerous outside stairs | 5 | To live in the city (left the |  |
| No court | 4 | country) | 12 |
| No cellar | 3 | Arrears in rent : | 11 |
| No electricity | 2 |  | $\frac{11}{704}$ |
| No shed | 2 |  | , |
|  | 752 | Unsatisfactory environment: |  |
| Hygienic conditions: |  | Too much noise in the vicinity | 17 |
|  |  | Did not like the ward. | 10 |
| Too cold | 218 | Did not like neighbors | 5 |
| Too damp | 138 | Too much smoke | 3 |
| General insalubrious conditions | 66 |  | 35 |
| Vermin | 47 | General: |  |
| Too dark | 45 |  |  |
| Too dirty | 11 | Thrown out by owner | 102 |
| Smell | 3 | Wanted change | 33 |
| Stables | 3 | Death in family (or sickness) | 23 |
| Chimney in bad order | 2 | Harsh relations with owner | 11 |
| No bath | 2 |  | 169 |
|  | 535 |  |  |

76. Fconomic or social reasors accounted for $66 \%$ of the answers to the question: What were the factors leading to the choice of the present dwelling?" Specific reasons are summarized as follows:

## Hygienic conditions:

Well lighted 26

Warm or easily heated
11
Well ventilated
6
Salubrious 5
Clean
Bath
Conditions of building or dwelling:
Comfortable (or "good enough")
Large
First storey or court-yard
Balcony
Heated flat

## Economic or social reasons:

Near work ..... 185
On account of lower rent ..... 112
Cwner of house ..... 109
To take house by themselves ..... 93
Owing to commerce or business ..... 61
To save money ..... 42
To live with parents ..... 13
Near parents (or friends) ..... 8
Children of owner ..... ${ }^{7} 6$
Janitor ..... 4
Near school ..... 4
Near church ..... 1

## General:

| Matter of taste | 112 |
| :--- | ---: |
| No other choice | 24 |
| Like the ward | 12 |
|  | 148 |

77. One of the largest employers of industrial labour conducted for us during the course of the survey a study showing the distance of the residences of their employees from the factory. For the most part, this group of industrial workers found their housing accommodation within easy walking distance from their place of employment:

| Zone | Distance from Home | Men | Vomen | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Less than $1 / 2 \mathrm{mile}$ | 214 | 385 | 599 |
| 2 | $1 / 2$ to 1 mile | 64 | 176 | 240 |
| 3 | 1 to 2 miles | 125 | 237 | 362 |
| 4 | 2 to 3 miles | 58 | 54 | 112. |
| 5 | 3 to 4 miles | 48 | 59 | 107 |
| 6 | 4 to 5 miles | 31 | 54 | 85 |
| 7 | 5 to 6 miles | 7 | 6 | 13 |
| 8 | 6 to 7 miles | 1 | - | 1 |
| 9 | More than 7 miles | 35 | 28 | 63 |
|  |  | 583 | 999 | 1382 |

78. From the survey records, 537 cases are noted of workers who take the tramway or autobus to their place of employment. The average cost of sich transportation is $\$ 1.07$ per week.
79. In 4,C54 ceses opinions were expressed by the occupants indicating their preference as to where they would like to live:

| Present locality | $92 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Suburb | $4 \%$ |
| Country | $4 \%$ |

80. Relations between proprietors and tenants seemed on the whole to be good. Some tenants consider their landlord responsible for all the evils of the world; while others consider him quite respectable, and say nothing derogatory against him.

What constitutes a slum?
The term "slum" is used so generally and generously in describing certain sections of the modern city that it is well to know with some exactness just what we mean when we use the word. No useful purpose is achieved by applying a descriptive term to a condition which does not fulfill the relative content which the term itself implies. Conversely, nothing is gained by our avoiding the use of a word, no matter how distasteful it may sound to some ears, when only that word fully expresses the condition we are seeking to describe. In making use of a term such as "slums", it is well to define with some precision the intent and content with which the word is applied.

According to one authority, a slum is stated to be "a foul back street of a city, especially one with a slovenly and even vicious population", also, "a low or squalid neighborhood". 1

Another authority records that ma slum is a street, court, or alley, which reflects the social condition of a poor, thriftless, irregularly employed and rough class of inhabitants. Bread and litter in the streets; windows dirty, broken and patched with brown or white paper; curtains dirty and frayed, and blinds half-drawn and often hanging at an angle. The street doors are usually open, showing bare passages and stairways lacking bannisters, while the door jambs are generally brown with dirt and rubbed shiny by the coats of the leisured class, whose habit is to lean up against them ${ }^{*}{ }^{2}$

While another authority states: "The common denominator of the slum is its submerged aspect and its detachment from the city as a whole. The slum is a bleak area of segregation of the sediment of society; an area of extreme poverty, tenements, ramshackle buildings, of evictions and evaded rents; on area of working mothers and children,

1 Webster's New International Dictionary, 1933 Edition.
$2^{2}$. Duckworth, cited by B.S. Townroe in "The Slum Problem".
of high rates of birth, infant mortality, illegitimacy, and death; an area of pamshops and second-hand stores, of gangs, of "flops" where every bed is a vote. As distinguished from the vice area, the disintegrating neighborhood, the slum is an area which has reached the limit of decay and is on the verge of reorganization as missions, settlements, play-parks and business come in. " 3

In the sense with which the foregoing descriptions conjure up in one's mind the idea of old rickety tumbledown houses, forlorn and neglected, narrow and dirty alleyways, pestilence and social decay, poverty, vice and filth, Montreal, on the whole, is relam tively free from such conditions.

Not that there does not exist, here and there, an individual dwelling or a rear-court or alley community which reflects or verges on these conditions. Indeed it would be surprising in a metropolitan city such as Montreal, if they did not exist. But to assert that there are any wide slum areas in Montreal of the aggravated type such as is found in many European cities is to melodramatize the facts. True it is that there exist spotty slum conditions of this sort, but they are few, and their extent is negligible.

In the sense, therefore, in which the term "slums" implies extensive deteriorated housing areas of this type, Montreal has no major slum problem.

But is that what we mean by "slums"?
Let us seek another authority. According to the Central Housing Committee, Washington, D.C., in a recently published glossary of housing terms, a slum is defined as "on area in which dwellings predominate that because of either dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light or sanitary facilities, or a combination of these factors are detrimental to the safety, health, morals, comfort and welfare of the inhabitents thereof".

If we accept the above definition, we are bound to affirm that there are districts in Montreal which can aptly be described as "slum areas".
${ }^{3}$ Harvey Warren Zorbaugh, "The Gold Coast and The Slum".

They probably do not dramatically rofloct each and every one of the characteristics mentioned in the foregoing definition. Overcrowding is not in wide evidence. Sanitary facilities are, on the whole, passable. But these districts do embrace predominantly old housing. Much of it is obsolescent, a considerable portion of it is dilapidated. The arrangement or design of the dwellings; either in their structural defects or the manner in which they are crowded on the land, along with "a combination of other factors are detrimental to the safety, health, morals, comfort and welfare of the inhabitants thereof".

In this sense Montreal has a slum problem.
However, while we submit that slum areas exist in tho sense in which we have described them, we tend to the opinion that a better term would be to describe such districts as "sub-standard". But it matters little whether we refer to them as slums, or blighted areas, or sub-standard housing districts; in the final analysis they are equivalent, more or less, to the same thing. They represent a condition of society which is offensive to our sense of decency and a standing challenge to the social stability of the community.

As such, they represent an economic liability, the social costs of which are too expensive a luxury for us to indefinitely continue to tolerate.

## SLUM CLEARANCE

Equally important in our effort to clarify the use of terms is the need to clearly understand certain related cardinal principles. In the public mind slum clearance and low-rent housing are virtually interchangeable terms, The one, ipso facto, is thought to be the solution of the other. But this is not necessarily so.

The purpose of slum clearance is not essentially to provide the cleared space for new low-rent housing, Nor is the aim of low-rent housing primarily to eliminate the slums. Slum eradication is one problem and low-rent housing is another. While in certain cases a low-rent housing project might properly replace a slum district, actually
the two problems are distinct and separate phases of community development, demand different approaches, and will likely require quite different measures for their solution.

Too little consideration is given to the fact that there are other kinds of slums besides those associated with blighted housing areas. There are commercial and industrial slums as well. To procead on the theory that most of the slum areas we know consist largely of residential properties, and that the universally applicable means of reclaining thom is by housing, is bound to load to disappointing results.

For while it is perhaps reasonable to assume that a proportion of the population presently occupying sub-standard housing might be appropriately rehoused within the blighted area which is to be reclaimed, it may, and probably in some cases will develop that such re-housing is undesirable on several counts.

First, the arca may be better used for other purposes, for a grouping of goverrment buildings, for industry, for a re-organization of traffic ways with parks and recreation space, or even as a high class residential section.

Second, the cost of land acquisition may prove to be too expensive for low-rental housing.

Third, the industrial activity which probably was the chief causative factor leading to housing blight in the first case, and which served to attract a low-wage group seeking opportunity for industrial employment, may be in the process of remcring itself from the district. In such a case it would be unwise to proceed with a low-rent rehousing programe when the future possibilities of the district would seem to discourage such a project.

No demolition programme of any proportions, however, should be proceeded with until a prior programe of housing, equivalent to the anticipated volume of residential demolition, has been completed.
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Maison isolee
Defached house
Maisons jumelées
Semi-detached houses
Duplex

Maisons mitovennes
ROW HOUSES
Plain-pied - létage F/at - / story
plain-pied-2éroges
Flat-2 stories
Plain-pied - 3 étages
flat- 3 stories
Maison dappartements - Létages
Apartment-house - 2 stories
$++$
Matson d"apoartements - 3 etages
Apariment-house - 3 stories

Commerce
Business
Indusirie legère
Light industry
Deux étages de plain-pied sur
un ejage de commerce
Two stories of flats over
one story of business

## HOUSING CONSTRUCTION AND

POPULATION GROWTH IN MONIRRAL

## 1925-1936

During normal years (1925-1931) an average of over 5,000 new dwelling units were erected annually in Montreal. In the past six years (1932-1937), the average has dropped to well under 1,000. A conservative estimate of the back-log of residential construction would be 20,000 dwelling units.

Residential construction during the pre-depression years kept pace with the increar se in the population. Since 1931, however, while residential construction has declined by at least eighty percent, the growth in population has prodeeded at approximately the same pre-depression rate; in the five-year period (1926-30), the natural increase of the population was 52,081, while in the next five-year period (1931-35), the increase was 48,215 ; or an annual average during the ten years 1926-35 of 10,029. No estimate of the influx of immigrant population is available.

The number of marriages taking place in Montreal up to 1931 was on the average slightly more than 6,000 per annum. During 1932 and 1933 the number dropped below 6,000, but since 1934 has been well over the average, and in 1936 reached the highest peak during the past twelve years, totalling 7,635.

During the depression a large number of families have doubled-up, two or more families occupying the same domicile. Among the unemployed this practice has been particularly prevalent, but it has by no means been confined to this section of the community. With the general business upswing this practice is tending to disappear. (Partially counteracting the effect on the housing market of these families now seeking separate residence, is the increasing tendency of proprietors to subdivide large single houses into multiple apartment dwellings.)

The Department of Health estimates that notwithstanding the fact that more than 500 insalubrious dwellings have been closed since 1929, there are at least 1000 dwellings
unfit for human habitation but which are being tolerated for residential purposes due to the fact that there is a shortage of low-rental dwellings. They further state that there are several thousand other dwellings badly in need of repairs in order to make them acceptable to the minimum standard.

Although the exact number is not known, there have been several hundred dwellings expropriated and demolished since 1929 to make room for public works and other developments.

According to the annual check-up of the City Assessors, residential vacancies have shown a steady decline during the past five years, reaching the lowest figure on record in 1936 when the percentage dropped to $3.75 \%$.

While there has been a marked increase in residential construction during the past eighteen months - although the volume is still considerably less than in normal years it has been confined almost entirely to housing well outside the range of working-class rents, and to wards where there is a negligible proportion of working-class tenants.

The average cost per unit (not including land or improvement charges) of new residential construction(excluding apartment houses) for the past 5 yoars is as follows:

| 1932 | $\$ 2245$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1933 | $\$ 2272$. |
| 1934 | $\$ 2878$. |
| 1935 | $\$ 3014$. |
| 1936 | $\$ 3862$. |

We are led to conclude, from the foregoing, that a housing shortage is imminent in Montreal. In our opinion this shortage will be most acutely felt by the low-wage section of the community, who must obtain shelter at rents from $\$ 10$ to $\$ 16$ per month.

## RECAPITULATION

Montreal is face to face with an acute housing shortage. A vast back-log of housing remains to be undertaken. The growth of the city's population proceeds without interruption. Delayed marriages are increasing the marriage rate. Families previously doubled-up are seeking separate shelter accomodstion. Unemployed, restored to gainful
employment, have returned to the competitive rental field. Vacancies have disappeared and the imminence of a rise in rents is in evidence.

In the next 5 years at least 20,000 new dwellings will be required if we are to make any improvement in housing standards.

## OBSERTVATIONS

Most of these new houses must be for low-income families. They are the ones who are ill-housed now, they are the ones who suffer most from a housing shortage and high rents.

Meanwhile our blighted areas multiply and grow more aggravated. We must have new dwellings to replace them.

Private enterprise is building only for midde-class and well-to-do families. Lowwage families cannot afford to pay rents for decent, sanitary shelter commercially built, without depriving themselves of necessary food and clothing.

Only with government aid can we clear our slums and build the low-rent housing that is needed to replace them.

A programme of government-aided housing does not involve competition with legitimate private enterprise. To the contrary, the experience elsewhere (England, for example) is that Government participation in low-rent housing has accelerated and encouraged private building. fovernment-aided low-rent housing is confined by a strict limitation to low income families - a market in which commercial building is unable to operate with profit. Trafficking in slum properties should not be tolerated, no matter under whose auspices it goes on.

Further, a programe of low-rent housing would have the effect of decreasing unemployment, and thus release a new flow of wealth to the community at large.
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Nombre de mariages à Montreal
Number of marriages in Montreal comparés au nombre de novveaux logemenenss compared with number of new dwelling units

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 㞔 <br> nstruits 437 bullt |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  <br> construits 5，099bult |  <br> construtr 550 bult |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  EONSTRUITS 5,838 BULI |  CONSTRUITS 948 BUILT |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  CONSTRUITS 5,869 buIL |  <br> CONSTRUITS 1751 BUILT |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  <br> CONSTRUITS 4,799 SULLT |  CONSTRUITS 1294 BUILT |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  <br> CONSTRUITS 3，739 BULI |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  CONSTRUITS 1355 BUILT |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 勫 <br> CONSTRUITS 1，106 BUIIT | 5 <br> Construits 68 bull |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 <br> CONSTRUITS 564 bullt | construits 47 BUILT |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 4 \\ \text { Construits } & \text { 499 Bult } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | E <br> CONSTRUITS 78 BULLT |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ， <br> Construits 543 buit | 葠 <br> CONSTRUITS 98 BUIIT |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 药 CONSTRUITS 674buIt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONSTRUTS213 BULL } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |

$V I I L E D E M O N T A$
MAISONS

| Année | Nombre de maisons | Nombre de logements | Valeur | Nombre de bâtiments | Nombre de logements |  | Valeu |  | Nombre de maisons | Nombre de logements |  | Valeur | Nombre logemen | total de nts nouvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1925 | 1757 | 5029 \$ | 10603983 | 147 | 330 \$ | 1 | 248 | 250 | 30 | 437 \$ | 1 | 506000 | 5 | 796 |
| 1926 | 1675 | 4741 | 10039050 | 158 | 358 | 3 | 242 | 700 | 46 | 550 | 1 | 660000 | 5 | 649 |
| 1927 | 1930 | 5401 | 12421470 | 198 | 436 | 2 | 547 | 450 | 75 | 948 | 2 | 486500 | 6 | 785 |
| 1928 | 2010 | 5532 | 12827609 | 143 | 337 | 1 | 760 | 300 | 121 | 1751 | 5 | 948400 | 7 | 620 |
| 1929 | 1616 | 4356 | 10613350 | 140 | 243 | 2 | 812 | 550 | 82 | 1294 | 5 | 387850 | 5 | 893 |
| 1930 | 1380 | 3580 | 9661670 | 86 | 159 |  | 775 | 100 | 60 | 892 | 3 | 044000 | 4 | 631 |
| 1931 | 1345 | 3535 | $\begin{array}{llll}9 & 314 & 992\end{array}$ | 96 | 212 | 1 | 239 | 800 | 106 | 1355 | 3 | 788300 | 5 | 102 |
| 1932 | 448 | 1045 | 2345850 | 34 | 61 |  | 229 | 550 | 6 | 68 |  | 158000 | 1 | 174 |
| 1933 | 294 | 546 | 1514050 | 16 | 18 |  | 118 | 400 | 4 | 47 |  | 48000 |  | 611 |
| 1934 | 250 | 463 | 1332750 | 23 | 36 |  | 265 | 500 | 6 | 78 |  | 158000 |  | 577 |
| 1935 | 268 | 518 | 1561450 | 16 | 25 |  | 133 | 200 | 9 | 98 |  | 231500 |  | 641 |
| 1936 | 332 | 656 | 2533475 | 18 | 18 |  | 196 | 050 | 20 | 213 |  | 490500 |  | 887 |

Source. - Statistiques du Service des Permis de construire.
VITALSTATISTICS
CITY OF MONPTREAL
1925-1936

| Year | Population July lst | Births | Proportion <br> per 1 wi | Deaths | Proportion per 1 M | Natural <br> Increase | Merrieges | Proportion per 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1925 | 693500 | 21976 | 31.69 | 9549 | 13.77 | 12427 | 6102 | 8.80 |
| 1926 | 713200 | 21098 | 29.58 | 9660 | 13.54 | 11438 | 6133 | 8.60 |
| 1927 | 733460 | 20740 | 28.28 | 9991 | 13.63 | 10749 | 6320 | 8.62 |
| 1928 | 754300 | 20307 | 26.92 | 10961 | 14.53 | 9346 | 6825 | 9.05 |
| 1929 | 775800 | 20415 | 26.32 | 10604 | 13.67 | 9811 | 7332 | 9.45 |
| 1930 | 796800 | 20993 | 26.33 | 1 C 256 | 12.87 | 10737 | 6643 | 8.34 |
| 1931 | 818577 | 20699 | 25.29 | 9886 | 12.08 | 10813 | 6196 | 7.57 |
| 1932 | 833000 | 19997 | 24.01 | 9728 | 11.68 | 10269 | 5780 | 6.93 |
| 1933 | 847000 | 18431 | 21.76 | 8975 | 10.60 | 9456 | 5964 | 7.04 |
| 1934 | 855000 | 18433 | 21.56 | 8955 | 10.47 | 9478 | 6536 | 7.64 |
| 1935 | 863000 | 17361 | 20.12 | 9162 | 10.62 | 8199 | 7035 | 8.14 |
| 1936 | 875000 | 16725 | 19.11 | 8934 | 10.21 | 7791 | 7633 | 8.72 |


|  | NATURAL INCREASE OF |  | THE | POPULATION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years | Births | Deaths | Excess of B over D |  |
| $1926-30$ <br> 5 years | 103553 | 51472 | 52081 |  |
| $1931-35$ <br> 5 years | 94921 | 46706 | 48215 |  |
| $1926-35$ <br> average | 19847 | 9818 | 10029 |  |

New Dwellings New Dwellings 07 dufproosy squipuoory According to
Permits Issued
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