

the future of this country, about their own future, and when confidence has been replaced in every home by anxiety for the morrow? Now the Prime Minister is trying to rejuvenate this country by this building policy. He is the architect, the nomad architect, who plans all sorts of things, all sorts of palliatives to make people forget that they have not the means of life, that they have not all a palatial suite in the Chateau Laurier. He says "Let us destroy slums." Another mistake he made which did not affect him was that tripartite plan of 1930, imposing the burden on the provinces and the municipalities. He forgot—naturally he was not interested in the matter—that the obligations imposed on the municipalities had to be met by the taxpayers, the owners of immovable property in the municipality. He said: "Things are bad; I will save this country; I will end unemployment." When he said that, people were under the impression that he alone was to do it. But then he imposed this heavy burden upon the provinces; he imposed a heavy burden on the municipalities. That burden on the municipalities was not merely on the shoulders of the community; it had to be met by private property owners in these municipalities, and these were unable to pay their taxes. And now, sir, what do we see? In 1931, when he came with his building program, the municipalities were already unable to meet the liabilities imposed upon them by the legislation of 1930. His great error of judgment was when he said that an expenditure of \$20,000,000 by this government would result in an outlay of \$75,000,000. He meant that the expenditure by the provinces and the municipalities would be more than the amount paid by the federal government, which was absurd. He said that by this government contributing \$20,000,000 the provinces and municipalities would spend \$55,000,000. Imagine that, sir. There should have been a great outburst of laughter when such an incredible thing was said by a so-called sensible man. In 1931 the provinces were unable to meet their obligations, and in order to enable them to pursue that silly building scheme the government had to lend money to the provinces with which to meet their own obligations. Loans were made to several provinces, why?

The CHAIRMAN: May I suggest to the hon. gentleman that we are considering a housing resolution?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, sir, and I speak of building and construction.

The CHAIRMAN: Of houses, please.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, sir, and what I say is perfectly relevant because I show that the previous construction policy of the government has been entirely wrong, and I show the mistakes that have been made in the past. The Prime Minister has said that this is no time to look at the past. I hope, sir, that in your fairness you will allow me to continue to speak of the past in order that the future may not be a failure as the past has been. And I will tell you more than that, sir, that the municipalities themselves were so burdened by that policy that some of them had to pay ten, twenty, thirty, fifty per cent—

The CHAIRMAN: The municipalities have nothing whatever to do with this. Will the hon. member please discuss the resolution?

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you, sir; I am through with that point.

Now let us look at another most important point, the destruction of public confidence. The government now has a housing policy. There are few people in this country who do not live under a roof. What do they want? They want to be able to earn their livelihood; they want to be able to dress themselves decently and properly; they want to have enough fuel to heat their homes in the winter time, and they want to eat three meals a day. That is what they want. A housing scheme is an important thing, but the most important thing to do, sir, is to give work to the unemployed. The members of the government say this will relieve unemployment; I just heard the right hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) make that statement. Probably that is so, but how many days on the average will they work? My remarks are strictly to the point, because the people who own immovable property in this country have been ruined by the burden of taxation imposed upon them due to the policies of this government, so they cannot build new houses. There are many fathers who had some money laid aside with which they hoped to establish their children in trades and build houses for them. Their children, who had employment in 1930, who left the old homestead for the city and found jobs, who married there and were living well until this government imposed their incredible policies, have lost their jobs now and have had to go back to their fathers in the country, not alone but with their wives and children, and the fathers, who are unable to sell their products, have to look after all those people.

The CHAIRMAN: Please stay with the housing resolution.