

of 90% it guaranteed the borrower against all losses up to 15%. Well, if the provinces, for instance, guaranteed the other 10%, the borrower would still have a margin of security of 25%; thus, the lending companies might make these loans because—and this should be noted—these loans are being made to a class of people whose moral guarantee is sound. In 1944, the government of Quebec, the government of our distinguished colleague from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Godbout) passed an act which was sanctioned on June 3. This act allowed the government to guarantee the other 10%. I was very anxious that this act should be applied. Why should not the governments make use of such a measure without repealing the present act, under which the Quebec government pays 3% of the interest rate on loans up to \$6,000? The action of the Quebec government in paying part of the interest up to a certain amount was a very wise step, but only those who are in a position to lay out \$1,500 or \$2,000 can take advantage of it.

Let us think of the salaried people with heavy family charges, honest industrious people, but who have never been able to lay away the 20% or 10% required to build a home. These people, however, who have always paid quite a high rent would be able to repay on the same basis and, after twenty or twenty-five years would own a house. A house costing \$10,000 at 5% interest might be repaid over twenty-five years by monthly instalments of \$58.46 and as, in the province of Quebec, the government pays 3% on more than half the loan, this would represent a rent of some \$40 a month. If 70% or 80% of our people were some day to become owners, much would have been done to contend with subversive ideas. The man who has a property to protect, a piece of land to defend, is in no mood to listen to communistic theories.

We complain that our young people are frivolous, that they have no respect for their neighbours' property. Let us afford them the means of looking after their own property, their own assets, and everything will be changed. A man naturally protects his own little homesite. On going over statistics I find that in some of the larger centres homeowners number hardly more than 14%; and when agitation breaks out in these localities I am not surprised; because more than 80% of the people there have nothing to defend, but everything to ask for.

In everyone of us, there is something which binds us to the piece of land, to the home where we were born and bred.

When I give lectures here and there, I like to hear the young people tell me what they do at home. At home! It means so much: it means the house where we live, the home where we find happiness, joy and love. Home is a thing we own. The word "home" brings back to my mind the verses of the poet:

Objets inanimés,
Avez-vous donc une âme
Qui s'attache à notre âme
Et la force d'aimer?

Let us take the means to make these dreams come true. Long speeches and sermons are useless. Let us act and, through co-operation in a truly constructive spirit, all political parties of the country will agree once for all in order to establish something which is alive, real and advantageous.

Some would like to know how much it would cost. They fear the government is going to spend to no useful end millions upon millions of dollars. The federal and provincial governments and even the municipalities may possibly lose a few million dollars. How much are we spending today for defence? How much for road construction and other things, and sometimes without any immediate results? We are preparing ourselves for defence, in case of attack; but moral defence is an even more constructive and real thing. To make the nation not only strong and powerful but also happy because there will be a deeper brotherly feeling and more love in the heart of each one of its citizens, to insure the peace and social welfare of every Canadian, it is well worth risking a few million dollars.

Great undertakings for the development of the St. Lawrence have been forecast. Here again, people are not of one mind. In every field, it is the same; but in every case we have the future in mind and the development of the whole country.

Canada is not a mere province; it is a vast country stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In a few years time our majestic St. Lawrence will be opened to the very heart of the country and bring prosperity to all the provinces. St. Laurent, a symbolic name for us, indeed. Our Prime Minister is called by the same name as our great river. Is this not symbolic, that he should be