

APPENDIX No. 2

incapacitated by the war. A hostel for unmarried men is to be provided and workshops are to be built to employ those men who are unable to follow their previous employment. Obviously, the scheme is only of interest as indicating one form of providing a local memorial.

At Longniddray, near Edinburgh, a small garden village was started in 1918 by The Scottish Veterans' Garden City Association. It is maintained by private contributions. Memorial cottages are erected by churches and schools in this village. This is a good form of memorial and cities and towns should be encouraged to honour the memories of the soldiers that have fallen by improving the housing conditions of the families they have left behind.

Miscellaneous Proposals

The West of Scotland Agricultural College offered a prize for the most suggestive scheme for the training and employment, especially in rural occupations, of discharged and disabled soldiers and sailors. The prize was won by Mr. Thomas Young, F.S.I., and Mr. W. R. Young, C.E. The scheme suggested regeneration of the *present* rural villages, on the basis of a survey to be made under the auspices of the county authorities. It was proposed to settle 4,000 ex-service men in eighty villages, allowing fifty for each village.

The advantages of this scheme were that it did not need new legislative machinery. It did not segregate the soldiers in special colonies; it did not mean the creation of entirely new communities but additions to existing organized units of population; and it had in view the intensive cultivation of land round small centres rather than purely rural holdings. It was considered that the advantages of social intercourse or co-operation could be obtained in this way, better than by creating new villages or scattered settlements. Although well favoured, no action followed.

The Garden Cities and Town Planning Association also proposed a scheme for discharged soldiers and sailors in 1916. It did not introduce any new features and no action was ever taken to put it into effect.

It is difficult to draw any conclusion from what is being done in England in connection with government housing for the reasons that conditions in Canada are so different and the housing shortage is not so serious. Land is cheaper, in the average English city than in the average Canadian city. The cost of developing land is less in England, as they do not make their streets so wide and make their schemes conform more to the topography of the land than we do in Canada. Non-traffic residential streets, as narrow as 10 feet, are made to serve where we have 66 feet in Ontario. The former is too narrow and the latter is too wide for residential streets not required for main thoroughfares. Building materials are scarcer in England. The cost of building has increased about five times in England since 1914, whereas in Canada, it has increased from three to four times.

There is a Rent Restriction Act in force in England which has kept rents low but practically killed private building enterprise till the government offered the subsidy to the builders.

There is no intermediary government authority between the National Government and the municipality such as we have with the Provincial Governments of Canada.

The tenancy system in England requires entirely different treatment from the ownership system in Canada.

Some general conclusions, however, come to the surface, no matter what the difference in conditions or problems. The English Government probably has had more experience, over a large period, than any other national government in housing administration and their tendency is to enlarge rather than to diminish their responsibilities in this connection. With financial liabilities greater in proportion to those of the Canadian Government they are facing a dead loss of at least \$1,000,000,000 in erecting 800,000 houses which will provide for a population equal to half that of Canada.