

search of some definite ideas. However, I am in favour of this country making some provision for a class of people who, from the nature of our climatic conditions and seasonal industries, find themselves at certain times of the year out of employment. I think that the necessity for such provision is the keynote to and practically the only excuse for a resolution of this kind. We have in Canada many industries which of necessity must be classified as seasonal industries. For example, we have the lumbering industry, which is carried on to a large extent in my own constituency, where for five or six months of the year there is steady employment after which the men engaged in it find themselves out of work and for two or three months have a hard job to make a living. I think a somewhat similar condition exists in the west. Every summer we have a call from the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba for help to harvest the crops. We all know that those men are engaged in that work for sixty or ninety days. Then they are turned loose on the labour market, and for practically a month or two months they find themselves out of employment. Now I imagine every hon. member knows that the main thing in making a living is to have steady employment even if it is at a lower wage. A man who has steady employment without the necessity of travelling from one province to another, or from one part of a province to another, incurring expense in the shape of hotel bills and railway fares, is much better off than the person who, from necessity, has to follow a seasonal occupation. That is the class in Canada for whom I think we shall ultimately have to make some provision. I do think, and I have made this statement before, that a country as big as Canada, with its vast resources and small population, ought to be one of the wealthiest in the world. Unfortunately we have climatic conditions to face and those conditions practically bring about seasonal occupation. I am prepared to support legislation at this time in the interest of the man who is engaged in a seasonal occupation, but I want to place myself upon record as being strongly opposed to building up in this country a pauper class dependent upon the government for assistance.

That brings me back to a point mentioned by the last speaker. If legislation of this kind is going to be enacted there must be contributions by the individual himself. We cannot introduce into Canada anything pertaining to the dole system of Great Britain. That system is unnecessary here. It is derogatory to the development of a sound national sentiment and is repugnant to a self-respecting,

(Mr. McGibbon.)

independent and hardworking people. Independence is one of the things we should seek to inculcate in the Canadian character. The man who deserves to be encouraged is the man who is independent of his neighbour, independent of the government, independent of anybody, and who relies upon his own resources. I supported legislation of this character in 1921. I rather think, although I have not had the time to go through Hansard, that I supported the principle even before then. At the same time there is a danger that such assistance may encourage certain of our population in the towns and cities to live on the government, a condition which is derogatory to self-respect and not conducive to the formation of a healthy national character. I support the principle which underlies this proposal but at the same time I point out these drawbacks. In a country with such vast resources and such a small population there should not be any need for providing for such cases if we had a proper national policy.

Mr. G. D. MORIN (Bagot) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to briefly state my views on the resolution No. 15. I shall consider it from three different points of view. First, constitutional; secondly, moral; and thirdly, economical.

First, constitutional. The British North America Act seems to provide for such cases—I mean of philanthropy—as those unfortunate enough to be without means. I think that the fathers of confederation were well inspired when they left the provinces with full power to dispose of these questions regarding public charity. As I glance over this resolution, I come to the conclusion that if the fathers of confederation had then foreseen not so much the state of poverty, as the economic need which the country would have to face, they would again have been justified in making provision for provincial autonomy in connection with questions of such import. Indeed, the principle of provincial autonomy is justified not only from the economic viewpoint but also if we consider the more immediate interest we take as regards our poor and those who are destitute. Each province having its own government, its own clergy entrusted with the duty of enlightening the people, can better sort out those who are destitute and need public assistance. I state that each particular province is better able to determine those whom they must support with public money, and, that the Dominion government cannot act for each separately.

As to its moral merit? We, in the province of Quebec particularly—I am better