

by increasing their taxation. Rather, we will reduce it. This type of public works is more inclined to increase unemployment than to relieve it.

A suggestion has been made to me which I place before the government for its consideration. It is this: I walk down the streets of this city and I see scores, yes hundreds of houses which ought to be first-class dwelling houses for years to come, and would be first-class if the owners were able to keep them in repair. But because the owners have not the money required for repairs those houses are falling into disrepair. They will soon be uninhabitable. I go into the rural sections of the country and I find hundreds of houses, outbuildings and fences in the same bad condition, all falling to pieces because the owners have not the money to keep them in repair. If we have to tax ourselves for the relief of unemployment would it not be the better part of wisdom to spend the money so raised in such a way that it will be most widely diffused, and will not saddle us with any maintenance cost? Would it not be wise to advance money to people for the improvement of their homes, so that they may make the necessary repairs? Would it not be wise to let the farmers have money to repair their fences, their outbuildings, and make other necessary expenditures, and in that way spread the money over the widest possible area and give employment in the most remote corners of the country as well as in the larger centres of population? By so doing we would avoid the necessity of saddling the government with maintenance costs in later years. I submit that suggestion to the government in all good faith, and in the hope that they will give it consideration.

Mr. BROWN: I listened with a good deal of interest to the eloquent remarks of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett), and to those of the highly-respected member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcell), both of whom spoke of the return to the land as a solution for our great problems. I wish I could become as enthusiastic about that solution as are these two hon. gentlemen. I realize, as all hon. members must realize, that as a temporary measure many might be put in a position whereby they could earn sustenance. However it is difficult for me to see that the return of large numbers of people to the land, particularly through the use of the compulsory methods which have been described, would meet the problem. It has been suggested that the farmer should go back to the use of primitive methods and that, as in pioneer days, the farm should become a self-

[Mr. Young.]

contained unit. I am ready to concede that if farmers to-day are content to live as did their pioneer forefathers, perhaps they may continue to live on the land and provide from it the bare necessities of life. But I do not think we could expect nor have we the right to expect that the rural population should be compelled to deny themselves all the privileges, conveniences and comforts enjoyed by the city dwellers. I do not think we have any right to expect that the farmers should be content with less of the good things of life than are enjoyed by people in the cities. I would make the suggestion to the hon. member for Stanstead—and I should not like to make it to the venerable member for Bonaventure—that he is yet a comparatively young man and, as some of the rest of us have done, he might set an example by going back to the land and showing the people how they can live on it and enjoy the comforts and conveniences which he now enjoys in the city. If the hon. member for Stanstead left Montreal, that city would lose a good lawyer, but the country would gain a man of capacity and intelligence, and one who would be able to use his intelligence to show how this problem can be solved.

No, Mr. Chairman, the farm problem is not to be solved in that way. It seems to me there are certain inevitable difficulties under which a farmer must live. Perhaps in the very nature of things he cannot expect all the conveniences enjoyed in the city. But recognizing, as many of us do, that there are certain inevitable and natural handicaps from which the farmer must continue to suffer, would it not seem to be an act of wisdom for the government, instead of raising artificial barriers, instead of increasing by tariffs and other means the artificial obstacles with which we have to contend, to remove these artificial barriers so as to make the natural difficulties less difficult for us to overcome. That is just where those who represent the school of thought to which I belong differ from those who represent the school of thought of the Prime Minister. One reason I could give strong support to many of the measures adopted by the preceding administration was that they did attempt to do at least something, probably not as much as I should like to have seen them do, to make it possible for us to secure the implements of production at a cost lower than that at which it is possible to procure them when they have to be purchased in the face of high tariffs. That at least is doing something to remove the natural handicap under which the farmers labour. Again I invite the hon. member for Stanstead to put his theories into practice and show