

food, a nursery service which would have allowed the mother, if it had been necessary, to go to work to help the family—all this was provided for \$62 a month. I should be interested to hear the minister's comparative figures of lower cost accommodation elsewhere.

This is not the only case that I am thinking of. There is in the employ of this House of Commons a stenographer who lived with her husband, a veteran, in a community apartment house at North Battleford. They paid \$30 a month for a three-roomed suite, and this included light, heat, water and laundry services. They have no children and she, too, could have gone out to earn part of the family income. I do not think this socialist government, which the minister speaks of in a rather derogatory manner, is doing too badly. This subsidized project is providing accommodation for people which cannot be obtained—and I say this with due respect to the minister—in any other place in Canada.

Mr. HOWE: I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that all the subsidizing is by the federal government.

Mr. KNIGHT: I am not suggesting that we should not have subsidization by the federal government; I am suggesting that we should.

Mr. HOWE: I was suggesting that not much subsidizing is being done by our friends in Saskatchewan.

Mr. KNIGHT: I have put the case as I see it. I wanted to get that on the record, because I do not think the minister has been fair in what he has had to say about our government or about the accommodation we are providing for these boys. This lady to whom I was speaking this morning who lived in the North Battleford project tells me that there is a long list of people who want to get into these apartments. These are the only apartments in this country that I know of where a veteran can live on the present veterans allowance and be able to attend university.

Mr. McILRAITH: Has the hon. member the capital cost of the building?

Mr. KNIGHT: I have not. I presume that that information would be in the department and be more readily available to the hon. member.

Mr. McILRAITH: I was asking a serious question because I wanted to follow the hon. member's argument.

Mr. KNIGHT: I know that the Saskatchewan government paid the same price as any other purchaser for war assets. I do not know

[Mr. Knight.]

whether the Saskatchewan government was subsidized in their purchase of these air force buildings.

Mr. HOWE: They were subsidized for the cost of fitting them up as apartments.

Mr. McILRAITH: I presume that the cost the government paid was eight per cent, but I want to ask the hon. member if he knows whether that is so, or did they get the buildings for nothing?

Mr. HOWE: They got them for nothing.

Mr. KNIGHT: Those figures are more easily available to the hon. member than to me. I do not know the facts, but I presume that the Saskatchewan government paid the same for the buildings as anybody else paid. I know they had tremendous difficulty in getting some of these war assets from the department.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, I will not be astonishing anybody in the house if I say that I am opposed to the amendment. I am opposed to subsidized housing for the same reason I am opposed to socialism. I do not believe it is in the interests of the people that their dwellings and homes should be owned by the government. I believe that that would give a new control to the government over the lives and activities of the people which would be a serious infringement upon the liberty and freedom to which we attach so much importance. However, there is nothing novel in this point of view and it is not the reason which prompts me to take part in this debate.

The building of houses is taking place principally in the industrial centres. Earlier in the week I came from Toronto by air, and I saw the great number of houses that have been built just outside that great city and also the housing developments that have taken place within the old city itself. The clamour for housing arises from the industrial population. There has been some natural increase in that population, but the principal increase is the accretion to the urban population resulting from the industrial activities of the war.

When Canada was engaged in the war she made a most substantial contribution to the allied cause through the production of industry. As a result people who had lived on the land and in smaller centres came to the factories, which were largely, if not entirely, concentrated in the great cities. The soldiery returning from the front came to the cities, some of them with wives whom they had married abroad. They took up residence in the cities. To a considerable extent it is