

ago. The province of New Brunswick gave a two year extension, but that does not seem to meet the situation. I know cases where houses have been built under the federal housing act and the parties have since lost them through not being in a position to comply with the conditions under which they received the loan. After having paid say \$2,000 on a house worth \$4,000 or \$5,000, they find themselves ousted from it and the house sold to others for the difference between the amount paid and the cost, so that they are out \$2,000. Could anything be done in such a matter?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Gloucester will agree that is a matter solely within the jurisdiction of the province and in regard to which we cannot exercise any jurisdiction.

Mr. VENIOT: The federal government could make representations.

Mr. BENNETT: When the provinces have made representations that they desire to grant more generous terms to their borrowers, the dominion has extended equally generous terms to them. That is my memory of what has been done so far.

Mr. VENIOT: I agree with that.

Mr. POULIOT: We have heard a lot about the national debt of Canada, federal, provincial and municipal, amounting to so many billions of dollars. The debt has been considered as a liability. But if it is a liability with regard to the debtor it is an asset for the creditor. During last summer I communicated with the provincial treasurers and secretaries of each province of Canada, and I received astounding answers, indicating that in seven provinces out of the nine it was impossible to get any idea of the total amount of mortgage debt within the province. The only actual answer I received was from the province of Ontario; I got a report from the superintendent of insurance which was far from complete, and I got a letter from the provincial secretary of Quebec saying that in 1929 the total amount of registered mortgages was nearly one billion dollars, for the one year only. Therefore the reports that are given by the bureau of statistics for the whole country are far from complete and must be wrong. It seems to me that before studying a matter of such importance the government should see to it that the house is supplied with all available informa-

tion concerning the total amount of mortgages in each province, in order that those mortgages might become productive of national revenue to a certain extent—if not the mortgage itself at least a part of the interest thereon. I wonder if the government has any objection to seeing that that information is made available to the house.

Mr. BENNETT: At the last census an effort was made for the first time to ascertain the mortgage indebtedness of rural Canada. The total as returned and estimated as I shall presently indicate was \$726,000,000. The direct returns indicated a total indebtedness of \$671,776,000 on the owned farm lands of Canada, which represent \$566,016,900 on 208,460 farms out of a total of 586,299 fully owned farms, and \$105,759,600 or 34,390 out of 67,942 partly owned. I shall presently indicate what the difference is between owned and partly owned in the census figures. The final figure of total farm mortgage indebtedness was arrived at by adding to this figure that I have just given an estimate of the mortgage indebtedness on the rented portion of 67,942 partly owned farms and on 74,382 rented farms operated by tenants.

Three distinct classes were considered; (a) fully owned farms; (b) partly owned farms, that is in which the element of tenancy enters with respect to the property in question; and (c)—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I ask the Prime Minister if the definition of the first class, (a); means operated by the owner?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, the whole property was owned by the operator. Lastly (c), farms operated by tenants.

The method by which the estimate was made with respect to those matters not covered by exact information is given by the bureau as follows:

The census returns provide indebtedness figures for about 77 per cent of all Canadian farm land. The estimate of indebtedness on the remaining 23 per cent is arrived at by considering first the 36,000,000 acres in the partly owned, partly rented group, of which about 18½ million acres are owned and 17½ million rented.

That is the second class to which I alluded a moment ago.

The census figures cover 107,000,000 acres of fully owned land, and the 18½ million acres of owned land in the partly owned, partly rented group, a total of 126,000,000 acres. It is therefore necessary to make an estimate for the 20,000,000 acres of fully rented land and the 17½ million acres of rented land in the partly