

justice toward society, and which must naturally bind them first to their parents. Observe that they are noted for their powerful associations and the care they give to the education of their children who rank at the head of their classes in our English and French institutions. For the present, sir, we may disregard immigration as a problem, and we must condemn this present system wanting us to accept an intensive immigration under false colours, the real aim of which is to rid the motherland of its problem of unemployment and bring on a peace without sacrifice to its millionaires. We are in duty bound to safeguard the rights of our working class to a living and at a reasonable salary. Already our unemployed are sufficiently numerous in our towns, and we are not anxious to see a renewal of the scenes, troubles and hardships of 1913, when, without any consideration whatsoever, we attracted to our shores large waves of immigrants. Moreover, there is nothing to hurry us to over-populate our country and find ourselves facing the same problem as in the United States which to-day are forced to enact quota legislation. In Italy, Germany and Japan overpopulation of a restricted territory is a source of much trouble. Let the motherland preach the spirit of sacrifice and patriotism to her millionaires in order to better the lot of the people.

Canada is prosperous in all fields of activity, it behooves us to have an eye to its development, which may be slow if necessary, but sure, in such a way as to have this desirable state last as long as possible, and to guarantee to our people that life of freedom, peace and happiness that all nations seek.

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate it seems to have become a custom to say something about those who first dealt with the issues which arise in connection with the budget. I do not propose, as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) said, to toss many bouquets, but I think it only just to say with regard to the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Guthrie) that we were extremely pleased with his excellent presentation of his case, and I think perhaps it is not out of the way to say that it was one of the best speeches he has ever delivered in this house. However, while I admire the manner in which he presented his arguments I cannot say that I entirely agree with them.

Having said that, I want to add that one of the things which has struck me as rather remarkable in this house during the last few years is that during the whole session those who sit to the right of the Speaker almost

always adulate and praise the government in power of the day, seldom finding anything in their actions to criticize, while those who sit to the left of the Speaker almost invariably find fault with the government. Their very name, "the opposition," signifies that they are here to oppose, and this session the highest point of opposition was reached in the statement of the acting leader of the opposition that the present government had reached a carnival of extravagance through taxes wrung from the people. I think that was the height of the condemnation of the present government. However, there are evidences that the country at large is getting rather tired of this partisan state of affairs and this method of dealing with the business of Canada, the public takes with a grain of salt what may be said from the right of the Speaker in praise of the government or what may be said from the left of the Speaker in condemnation of the government. I was rather struck with an article appearing the other day in no less a Liberal paper than the Calgary Albertan, which is a strong supporter of the government. Dealing with this very question of partisan speeches, the article says:

Twice in the present session of the House of Commons members have been privileged to witness the rather unusual spectacle of members voting strictly according to conscience without reference to party.

I wonder if there could be a more striking condemnation of our partisan system than the statement that it is a most unusual thing to see members of the House of Commons voting according to their conscience. Then the article goes on to say that whether satisfactory results were achieved in these two deliberations during which members voted according to their conscience—

A tendency to independent thought in parliament is something to be welcomed. It encourages the hope that in Canada the day is coming when it may be no longer true that, as Gilbert said of the parliament at Westminster:

"When members of the house divide,
If they've got brains and cerebellum too,
They have to leave their brains outside
And vote just as their parties tell 'em to."

I was rather struck this afternoon with the remarks of the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). He took up the cudgels of the unemployed and spoke of poverty and sorrow in the city of Toronto; in fact I told him he would make a very good labour man and asked him why he did not sit in this corner with the representatives of labour.

Mr. McGIBBON: You must remember that he is opposing the government.