

However, I am not opposed to any immigration policy per se. I am of opinion that an immigration policy under proper conditions and preceded by proper efforts by this government, is of value and is probably of vital consequence to the country. What has the government done? First of all, it has called to its councils the Canada Colonization Company, a company which seems to plan as a basic principle a certain amount of real estate exploitation. The president and some of the officers of this company made a grand transcontinental tour, and immediately thereafter the whole project lapsed into a state of coma—no explanation offered. The president resigned, and one at least of the directors also resigned—no explanation offered. Well, it seems to me that the explanation does not require much seeking to find. I think the whole scheme is foredoomed to failure in that it is predicated upon a false basis—it does not take cognizance of the economic conditions existing. But the government goes further. It says: We will bring in some tenant farmers and put them on the land. These gentlemen have not much money; indeed, it is suggested that the transportation charges are so high that it will be difficult for them to get here anyway. And then, the "most unkindest cut of all," they take helpless orphans and endeavour to formulate an immigration policy for these poor, defenceless children. They, of course, can make no objection. They are helpless, and I presume they must take the consequence. Now, a proper immigration policy must be predicated by an adjustment, or readjustment if you like, of our economic conditions. Make farming in western Canada profitable and then you do not need much of an immigration policy. The best immigration advertisement for this country, is a prosperous and a contented farmer; if you have that you do not need to go to much expense—certainly the expense will be less than would otherwise be necessary. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if as a result of the government's effort many men and women are, under existing conditions, brought into the country, Canada will simply become a conduit pipe through which these people will pass on their way to the United States, where economic and general employment conditions are much more satisfactory than they are here. The country looks to this government for leadership in connection with these pressing economic problems. It is a strange fact, but nevertheless true, that for some reason or other, as soon as governments get into office

they become subject to a sort of creeping paralysis, a state of inaction and *laissez faire*. They become largely the numbed and chilled victims of circumstance. The people, therefore, are looking to parliament for a real leadership in these matters.

Turning for a moment, Mr. Speaker, from the internal conditions—which, I suggest, are not entirely without hope if you have a government of vision, a government of progress, a government not lacking in courage—turning from these conditions to external affairs, I think there is more ground for congratulation. During the time of the Near Eastern crisis the Cabinet indicated this country's position in regard to participation in war, and particularly in regard to the sending of a contingent to the Near East. I am glad that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet took the position that they did. They followed in the footsteps of that illustrious statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier; they indicated in no uncertain terms that the question of Canada's participation or non-participation in any war is a matter for the responsible representatives of the Canadian people in parliament assembled. In a matter so vital as war, involving, as it well may, the lives of thousands of our fellow-countrymen; involving the loss, perchance, of immense treasures of wealth; involving, as it well may in these latter days, the destruction of our whole civilization, it is imperative that the decision be made exclusively by parliament, or if not by parliament then by the people themselves. No group of men either here or elsewhere outside these two bodies should take any action committing the country to any condition of war. Action in respect to the eastern crisis was the more imperative in view of the fact, as those who are familiar with some at least of the circumstances must know, that the whole story of the Near East, both prior to the armistice with the Turks and subsequent thereto, has been a long series of secret intrigues, secret treaties, selfish aggrandizements. I would like to have seen the Prime Minister send a challenge to the old world from this new world of democracy indicating that so far as we are concerned we are through with that variety of old world diplomacy which has brought the earth almost to the brink of ruin, almost to the verge of despair. So I say that real progress has been made in the disposition of our external affairs during the recess.

May I say just in this connection that I believe Canada has latterly been looking altogether too much to Europe for its cue. I wish to quote, if I may be permitted, from a