

points which he endeavoured to discuss in the course of his remarks. First, may I deal with the question of immigration, because it helps to illustrate as well as any the difference in point of view between my right hon. friend and myself. He said he did not propose to be bullied or bludgeoned or cowed into not making any statement that he thought it was right and proper that he should make. I do not think anyone has ever tried to bully or cow my right hon. friend, and were such an attempt made I may say for him that I do not think it would be successful; my right hon. friend would say what he intended to say, no matter what the consequences were. He said that he thought it was the duty of a public man to state the facts, and he raised the point of patriotism in that regard. Now, I agree with him in that; I think it is the duty of a patriot to see that his country is fully informed in regard to its own affairs. But I would say to my right hon. friend that patriotism extends beyond the mere statement of facts to the interpretation that is put upon the facts, and the true patriot to my mind is the man who will endeavour to put the facts relating to his own country's affairs before the people in such a light as will best serve the interests of his country. In other words he will not seek to interpret the facts in such a way as to serve party rather than public ends, which is, I regret to say, what I am afraid, my right hon. friend has been doing in some of the statistics and alleged facts he has been quoting of late.

In regard, then, to the question of immigration let me give the facts in as few words as I can, and in the light in which I think they should be presented to the country. We do not pretend that during the first year or two we were in office we were successful in bringing immigrants into this country in large numbers. That was no fault of the administration. My right hon. friend had been in office the year before, but at that time, when arrangements should have been made preparatory to the bringing of immigrants from the Old Country, sowing the seed abroad so that results of some value could have been produced, he was not concerned about emigration affairs in Great Britain or elsewhere; he was thinking of a general election which he brought on in Canada in the fall of 1921. The result was that when we came into office we found that for a year or more practically the whole machinery of immigration had been stopped, allowed to run down and to rust, that nothing had been done; that as a consequence the flow

of immigration had virtually dried up at its source. Naturally, until it was possible for the government to reopen the offices abroad and get the machinery of immigration effectively at work, there could be no such quick returns as might otherwise have been effected. Let me say this in fairness to my right hon. friend: I think there was some excuse for his attitude at the time. We were just succeeding the period of the war. We had but recently been in the period of demobilization. Men had been brought back to this country by thousands and had to be re-established in industry. To have added large numbers of immigrants at that time, especially when there was the amount of unemployment as had existed during the preceding two or three winters, would not have been to help any immigration policy but would rather have created discontent and discord throughout the country, a condition which would have operated very seriously against the coming of immigrants to Canada later on. I want to put the facts clearly, as I think it is only by a plain understanding of the circumstances that the country will get a true appreciation of what has taken place.

May I draw attention to another fact, namely the position of Canada with respect to immigration as contrasted with the position of the country to the south? I need not remind this House—and by the way, I would like hon. members to keep this fact in mind throughout the discussion of questions relating to the conditions in Canada as compared with those in the United States, that Canada went into the war in August, 1914, whereas the United States went into the war in April,—I think it was April,—1917. While we with our much smaller population were spending over a million dollars a day in the maintenance of troops abroad, the United States was producing munitions, was producing ships, was selling vast quantities of supplies to Britain and the allies, and receiving in return vast sums of money. When the war was over we found ourselves with our public debt increased to the extent of two billions of dollars, \$1,650,000,000 of which had been added as the capital cost of the war, every single dollar of which was borrowed money and not a cent paid back. There is a circumstance which I think hon. members will do well to keep in mind—the whole capital cost of the war, so far as Canada is concerned, was met by hon. gentlemen opposite out of borrowed money. To-day we have to pay interest on that vast sum; we have to find means of paying off that principal. Yet my right hon. friend criticises us because public expenditures are so large.