

clear enough. I have now been supplied by the hon. member for Peterborough West, with a list of places where these houses are being built. The list gives British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario. Could we have one instance of the highest and the lowest contract in one of those centres in these several provinces? The minister can pick out my own particular city if he wants to. I am not concerned about getting my own constituency, but I should like to have one in the Ottawa area and in the Port Arthur area in Ontario, and perhaps one in the central part and another one in the western part of Canada.

Mr. HOWE: I have these arranged alphabetically, but I happened to turn up St. Catharines. This project was a small one, four bedroom houses, eighteen; six bedroom houses, eight; and five bedroom houses, twenty-four, a fifty house project. Tenders were called. The lowest tender was \$124,233. The next was \$132,000, the next, \$143,000, and the next, \$145,000. It was placed at \$124,000. The unit cost was \$4,190.68.

Mr. LOCKHART: Could we have one for this part of Ontario?

Mr. HOWE: I shall give the city of Hull: small four bedroom houses, thirty-eight; six bedroom houses, twenty-nine; five bedroom houses, eighty-three, a total of 150. The lowest tender was that of the Atlas Construction company, \$628,495. The unit cost was \$3,987.67.

Mr. LOCKHART: There are no foundations under these?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. LOCKHART: What is the comparative cost in British Columbia? Somebody suggested New Westminster. May I ask if these plans were all identical across Canada. Is the same plan being used, the same construction?

Mr. HOWE: I would not guarantee that, but there is not much difference. This is a project for 446 houses; the low tenderer is Smith Brothers & Wilson; the unit cost is \$3,927.68.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like at the outset to say to the minister that I am obliged for the information he brought down this afternoon. Unfortunately, although I thought there were two copies of the progress report, there is only one copy; that was taken away by the *Hansard* reporter, and I have not had an opportunity of perusing it. I should like to have had that opportunity.

There is no more important subject to come before parliament at the present session than the subject of housing. It has been discussed already; as far as I am concerned my views of the present situation were expressed in this house on October 25, and I do not intend to repeat what I said at that time, but what I said I believe emphatically to be correct. Anything which has been said since in this house or elsewhere has only gone to confirm the statements I made on that occasion.

We are asked to approve an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for housing developments for, as we are told, low-rent housing. In the first place I suggest, that if the government had been vigilant and alive, it would not have been necessary to resort to Wartime Housing Limited to construct low-rent housing. If we had had a proper national policy, that would have been done under the housing act without resorting to this costly device. The government let the situation go on until they were faced with an emergency requiring them, as they say, to depart from the original intention to confine Wartime Housing to what we perfectly properly considered was temporary housing, and to go into the field of permanent housing.

The minister said that none of the houses built by Wartime Housing are classified by the government or that corporation as temporary housing. They are alone in that respect, because I believe everybody who has seen them will say that they are temporary housing, not in the sense that they will last for only a year or two, but temporary in the sense that unless they have a great deal of care they will have deteriorated so far in four or five years that in constructing them in very large numbers we are creating incipient slums.

The minister says, "We do not construct temporary houses." In other words, houses built without foundations are, in the view of the minister and of Wartime Housing Limited, permanent housing. The desired information was obtained, however, in another way. We were told this afternoon that, of the 7,000 houses to be constructed, 800 are to have foundations. In other words, with the war over and with the present necessity of supplying houses for permanent abode, we are still going to have only 800 with foundations, and 6,200 without foundations. In the first place, that is wasteful. If we are to have 7,000 houses built by Wartime Housing Limited, let us have them built with proper foundations and cellars.

My next observation is on the subject of low-rent housing. The minister has indicated