

with which private enterprise would abandon any attempt to improve living standards in order to preserve profits and special privilege.

Coupled with such statements we hear the statement often repeated that unemployment might easily be cured if we inaugurated a "back-to-the-land" movement. Little attempt has been made to analyze the magnitude of the drift to the cities, or the impetus given that migration under planless private enterprise. According to a recently published statement of Professor Burton Hurd, in the intercensal decade, 1921-1931, there was a net movement away from rural sections of 440,000 over and above the gains in population through immigration. In the same period occupied farm land increased by 23,000,000 acres, or 16 per cent. Improved land on farms increased by 23,000,000, or 21 per cent. One factor contributing to this movement was the increased use of science and machinery, enabling the farmer to meet the requirements for farm products on the domestic and foreign market with a decreasing proportion of farm population, thus releasing an increasing number for employment elsewhere. It has also been shown that the birth rate is about sixty per cent higher in the country than in the city, and this also supplies an additional reason for the migration to the city. Since 1930 emigration to the south has practically ceased, and this has tended to dam back the accumulating rural surplus, awaiting more favourable employment conditions in the cities. Any back to the land movement of proportions to relieve the unemployment situation would simply add to existing agricultural surpluses, further depress prices, and increase the pressure on excess farm population to seek employment in the cities. It has been proposed that the unemployed in the cities should be settled on the land in such a manner as to enable them merely to produce their own requirements. This means the setting up of a peasant agriculture side by side with modern commercialized farming. It is unjust to expect the unemployed to endure the primitive living conditions imposed, while neighbouring farmers and the workers in nearby cities enjoy the comforts and conveniences of our society. They would quite naturally move back upon any signs of improvement in employment conditions, and therefore the plan has no semblance of permanence. In any event under present conditions it would only be accompanied by a contrary cityward movement which would defeat the purpose of the scheme.

We have depended on private enterprise for a solution of our housing problem. The speculative or profit making element has

completely frustrated all our efforts to meet an acute housing shortage and achieve the recovery of our construction industry. It is estimated by those making a close study of the situation that we require an additional 200,000 dwellings in Canada. Based on the figures given by the Bank of Nova Scotia, the accumulated demand for backlog for residential construction resulting from the lack of building since 1931 is now \$266,000,000. Only 126 loans have been granted under the housing act of 1935, while under the housing measure of 1919, some 6,250 houses were built. A total of 6,376 houses have been built in Canada as a result of state assistance. In order to compare these results with those achieved in other countries where the state definitely assumed some measure of responsibility for the problem, I should like to refer to a summary in *Modern Housing*, by Catherine Bauer.

In Holland, with a population of 7,527,000, a total of 450,000 dwellings were constructed during the period of 1919-1928. The total number built with state aid was 250,000, the number built by public authorities, 40,000, and the percentage of population living in state-aided dwellings was 15. In Belgium, with a population of 7,466,000, 250,000 dwellings were constructed during the period 1919-1933. The total number built with official aid was 200,000, the total number built by public utility societies was 70,000, and twelve per cent of the population lived in state-aided dwellings. Denmark, with a population of 772,000, constructed 45,800 dwellings in the period 1920-1929. Thirty-five thousand dwellings were built with state aid, 9,300 by public authorities, and twenty per cent of the population were living in state-aided dwellings. In 280 towns in Sweden with a population of 2,000,000, 129,800 dwellings were constructed in the period 1917-1929. The number built with official aid was 57,400, the number built by public authorities 12,200, and thirteen per cent of the population were living in state-aided dwellings. In five large towns in Norway with a population of 478,000, the total number of dwellings constructed was 16,600. The total number built with official aid was 14,900, and fourteen per cent of the population were living in state-aided dwellings.

In practically all these countries definite provision has been made for slum clearance and the provision of housing for those receiving extremely low incomes. In Canada we must sooner or later face the fact that a large portion of our population receives an income too small to provide itself with a minimum of decent living quarters. We are now committed to a policy of encouraging