

The end of the period is now in sight, and there is still no other accommodation for the one hundred families now living there. They are fairly well situated. They pay a rental to the two governments averaging about \$24 a month, and those who are employed in the city have to pay another \$15 a month for transportation to and from their work.

At the present time there is no possible chance for these one hundred men and their families to secure houses, so I should like the minister to give consideration to continuing this plan for the benefit of those people. It will not cost very much. The buildings are there. They may require a few repairs again this year, as all houses do, but generally speaking those families are fairly well located. They have a school and everything required; and the possibility that they may be ejected next September, with nowhere to go, presents a problem that I think well deserves the attention of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take part in the debate, but before doing so I rise to a point of order with respect to the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Timmins). I should like to say that I agree with the suggestions contained in the subamendment, as an addition to the proposal contained in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson), but I object to having those suggestions offered as an alternative.

It seems to me that this subamendment is out of order on two grounds. On the one hand, unlike our amendment which merely asks the government to consider a certain course, the subamendment in effect instructs the government to elicit certain co-operation and to do things that could not help but cost money. The other ground on which I suggest it is out of order is based upon a sentence I should like to read from May, thirteenth edition, at page 291:

An amendment to a proposed amendment cannot be moved, if it proposes to leave out all the words of such proposed amendment: but in such a case the first amendment must be negatived before the second can be offered.

The mere device in this instance of referring to "all the words after the word 'that'" is, as I have already characterized it, a device. In effect not only does it strike out all the ideas contained in our amendment, but it strikes out even the original motion, that Bill No. 280 be now read a second time.

For these reasons I submit that the subamendment, while containing good ideas, is out of order, and should be so declared.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): I must say the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is well taken. The subamendment is out of order, and I would refer to the citation in May, 13th edition, which reads:

An amendment to a proposed amendment cannot be moved, if it proposes to leave out all the words of such proposed amendment: but in such a case the first amendment must be negatived before the second can be offered.

This subamendment does that very thing, when it states that all the words after the word "that" should be struck out, and certain following words substituted therefor. Therefore I rule the amendment to the amendment out of order.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly to the amendment now before the house. It was moved by my deskmate, the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson) and it was my pleasure to second it.

It seems to me that this amendment really poses the crux of the housing problem in Canada at the present time. A few minutes ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) suggested that in effect the government is doing some subsidizing of housing. That is correct, and I am glad the principle of subsidizing housing is, to that extent at least, recognized and approved by the minister.

But the point we wish to make, and we do so by the very wording of our amendment, is that what is needed is the subsidizing of low-rental housing, with the emphasis on "low-rental". For a long time the suggestion that there should be subsidized low-rental housing came chiefly, if not solely, from this group. That day has, however, passed. We now have such organizations as the Canadian federation of mayors and municipalities, the Canadian construction association and many local groups, societies and organizations across the country pleading for subsidized low-rental housing.

Those pleas also call for something for which the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Timmins) asked in his remarks of a few moments ago, namely, that there should be a more definite attempt made to get together the three levels of government in respect of this housing problem. I support wholly his contention that that should be done. However, in the very words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there is not much point in the various levels of government getting together, if you rule out the element of subsidies. That will have