

almost as great as the block on which this building stands. These parcels of land are located in two different parts of the city. Instead of the new method that is proposed, the old company endeavoured to see how many houses they could get on a certain piece of ground irrespective of conditions. The result was that terraces of houses numbering from five, ten, fifteen, up to fifty were erected, and at the rear of each house there was a space of some fifteen feet, just sufficient for a revolving clothesline. This space was all open; there was no privacy. The result was that on wash-days the children playing around would run up against the clothes and there would be trouble. This occurred on many occasions. In front, there were nice lawns, which gave the houses a good appearance. In these houses there were three, five or six rooms on each floor, with three families in each house. The Housing Company completed the houses, and there has been a demand for them at good rentals. But it is stated that last year there was a loss to the management of over \$4,000, and this has occurred at a period when rents are up sky-high. If that is the condition now, what is it going to be in the future? This Housing Company have, as I understand from the report in the press, decided to hand the management over to some loan company or collecting agency. I think the company is trying to get out from under. That is the past experience of Toronto in regard to housing.

I like the ideas of the new commission better. They purpose building houses worth about \$2,500 or \$3,000. They purpose having a standard width of twenty or twenty-five feet, with a depth of eighty to one hundred, or perhaps 110 feet, with the lots properly divided from each other so as to ensure privacy. The houses are to have from four to six rooms. That idea is, I think, all right. The houses are to be either detached or semi-detached. Each family will have an opportunity to have their own yard, so that their children will have a private yard to play in, and with a rear lot of a fair size there will be opportunity for gardening, which will prove an advantage to this class of people. This class of house will, as the result of experience of the old system, be found to be more suitable for the working people. I see, however, one danger even at this time of erecting that class of house. As we know, things to-day are abnormal. Supposing, as is proposed, a house is built worth \$3,000, including the lot. When things become normal in two or three years from now, labour and material will be somewhat more

moderate, and there is a danger of such a house depreciating in value to the extent of from \$300 to \$500. These houses are to be sold to the working people, so that a workman who has bought one of these houses may find that his investment has shrunk from three to five hundred dollars, and he will become dissatisfied. If he has to leave the city and go to some other place to work, and finds it necessary either to sell or rent, and if he discovers that instead of three thousand dollars he can get only \$2,500, or if he has to accept a low rental, he will become dissatisfied and may throw up the deal. The danger is, therefore, that an unpleasant feeling may be created, and that would not be desirable. The principle, however, that the commission is working on as to the class of house and also in regard to expenditure in order to give work to a large number of people, is all very good, but there is, as I have explained, the danger of dissatisfaction afterwards.

This Government has offered money for housing to the provincial governments, and they in turn have offered it to the various municipalities. Neither the Dominion Government nor any of the provincial governments is taking any risk of loss in doing this. That risk falls upon the municipalities. They have to guarantee the provincial governments and the provincial government has, in turn, to guarantee the Dominion. Therefore, if there is any loss, it will fall on the municipalities, and the result might be serious. I do not know, therefore, that at this particular time the municipalities should rush into erecting more houses.

Another matter that I have no doubt will be before the House in a few days is the temperance question. We should, in my opinion, continue for another year the Temperance Act that was passed as a war measure, and then, as this is a large and important question, a referendum should be submitted to the people of this Dominion. When one mixes amongst the people in order to find out their views, one is convinced that this is a big question, and if it is settled by the people, the people should be satisfied and we should legislate accordingly. I believe this Government did the right thing in having that Act put through. I, as a citizen of Toronto, congratulate the provincial government on their War Measures Act, although they have got into bad odour for putting it through. But nevertheless I think they were right and they will come out right in the end. What would have been the position in Toronto if that Act