

activity, they folded up and nothing much came out of it. In other words, the policy of the government to date appears to me to be not one of subsidizing low-rental housing but rather of subsidizing private companies which are in the business of lending money to build houses to make profit.

The house will have to make a decision on that sooner or later. Either we are in favour of the government assisting directly in the building of low-rental housing for the purposes of the people, or we are not. When this amendment is put it will be interesting to note how my hon. friends of the official opposition vote, in view of the two directly contradictory speeches we have heard from that side of the house, one saying that subsidized housing is socialistic, and therefore he is opposed to it, in spite of the fact that it has been done in England for many years—

Mr. HACKETT: And see where they landed.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: As far as house building is concerned, I think the record of Great Britain compares very favourably with the present situation in Canada.

Mr. McILRAITH: Not very.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: We must remember that there was a little bit of destruction carried on in that country during the war, which we did not have here. But if we take their peacetime construction, both before and after the war, under the coalition and the labour governments, I think we shall find that their house-building program has been extraordinary, considering everything.

I believe enough evidence has been introduced in this house to show that, regardless of what we may think in terms of public or private enterprise, houses are not being built as fast as they are needed, and people with modest incomes are not able to rent even the houses which are available. Therefore the only answer seems to be subsidized housing, or else a lot of people will go without roofs over their heads.

Mr. G. J. McILRAITH (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may take a few minutes of the time of the house to deal with one or two points raised in the course of the debate. First of all, I should like to make a short reference to the statements made yesterday about Wallis house.

Mr. MacINNIS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, was it not ruled yesterday that any reference to that was out of order? I was not in favour of the ruling, but I think that was the ruling which was made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not recall.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I was discussing the matter, and was asked by the minister and by Mr. Speaker to discontinue, and I did not proceed with my discussion. I had my argument here. I understood the Speaker's ruling was that I was not allowed to continue.

Mr. GOLDING: Your leader did.

Mr. McILRAITH: On the point of order, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) discussed the matter at some length. He spoke after the hon. member who has just taken his seat. I merely wanted to let the house know what I thought might be of some interest to it with regard to that project. I am not defending the project nor advocating it as an ideal project. I think the house, in view of what was said by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, should have some information about how that project is administered, who administers it and under what authority. It was merely to complete the record. My recollection is that no point of order was taken.

Mr. FLEMING: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned with the particular issue, nor would I wish to curtail participation in this debate by the hon. member; but if you will refer to yesterday's *Hansard* you will see, at page 4163, that this was definitely made a point of order, and it was made a point of order by the minister himself. At page 4163 some reference is made by the hon. member for Mackenzie to the question and the minister intervenes:

Mr. Howe: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has nothing whatever to do with the operation of Wallis house, and I suggest that any discussion of that matter is entirely out of order.

There follows further discussion and the minister asks what that subject has to do with the bill before the house. There is still further discussion in which the minister participates, and Mr. Speaker says, at page 4164:

I would call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the bill before the house is an act to amend the National Housing Act, 1944.

There is further discussion, and at the bottom of the first column Mr. Speaker said:

May I call the attention of hon. members to the explanatory note in the bill. It states—

And then he quotes the explanatory note and concludes:

That is the principle of the bill before the house, and I think hon. members should confine their remarks to that principle.

Whether the point of order was properly taken at the outset or not, whether the ruling