

A.—No children under fourteen work in Russia.

Q.—How about those between 14 and 18 years? Do they work?

A.—Yes: but they only work three or four hours a day.

Q.—What do they do the rest of the day?

A.—They go to school.

Q.—How much are they paid?

A.—They get paid for a full day.

Q.—Are those children between 14 and 18 allowed to work at night?

A.—No.

Q.—How many hours do they work in Russia?

A.—Now, the workers work eight hours. At the beginning of next year they will only have to work seven hours.

Q.—Who owns the factories, mines and railways in Russia?

A.—The workers and the peasants own all the means of production.

Q.—Why should all workers defend Russia?

A.—Because it is the only country in the world where the workers and the peasants own the country.

Q.—Why do the papers talk about war with Soviet Russia?

A.—Because the capitalists who control the papers want a war with Soviet Russia in order to destroy Russia, the only country in the world where the workers rule (the capitalists use the newspapers to tell all sorts of falsehoods so that the people will not get the correct idea about Russia and the conditions there)."

There is no use in bringing immigrants to this country unless they can be employed. Mention has been made of the farmer and his son staying on the farm, but everybody who knows the farming community as I know it is aware that if there are three or four sons in a family only one can be kept on the farm; the others go into professions or employment of a different character, where they can enjoy themselves in cities and towns. What becomes of them? They flock over in thousands, yes in hundreds of thousands, to the United States, where they find employment in different lines such as they cannot find in Canada.

The other day I was reading a speech delivered by Sir Charles Gordon, who cannot be accused of being a Tory like myself, and it cannot be said that he is blinded by partisanship, as has been said of me. He shows that the position taken by the United States of giving protection to its citizens—protection to their employment and to their industries for the development of all lines—is the reason why our people are drawn from Canada. Every time we lower our tariff we send more and more of our citizens to the United States. I am only repeating the views of Sir Charles Gordon, without quoting his words.

It is a known fact that we cannot make everybody farmers. I have said in this House before, and I repeat, that the farmers have had a hard trial, and that they are the greatest

Hon. Mr. POPE.

speculators in the world. They have to speculate against nature, against climate, against soils, against rain, against sunshine, and they have to speculate away beyond their own judgment. Under these circumstances a man, in order to succeed on a farm, has to be the most economical person in the world in order to make the advance he should make in Canada. He cannot go out and do it in any other line.

As to trade, you say: Why, we have shipped so much more out of the country and have brought in so much more. That is an indication of progress. Yes, but we brought in more than we shipped out, and every time we bring in eighty or ninety or a hundred million dollars' worth of manufactured goods from abroad, those goods take the place of goods that should be manufactured by the citizens of Canada. Until honourable gentlemen opposite realize that, until that misfit organization with which they have allied themselves in another place realize what I am saying, they have no right to try to sectionalize Canada. This is a broad nation, extending from ocean to ocean, and every part of it is entitled to the same consideration and treatment.

Speaking of immigration, I observed the other day an article stating that the Government had proposed to hand over \$50,000 to bring French Canadians back from the United States. Any man who knows me—and there are two or three in this House who know me and who know the stock from which I come—is well aware of my position so far as the French Canadians are concerned. But I would like to know what is the matter with the English speaking Canadians that they should not be brought back.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: They are being attended to.

Hon. Mr. POPE: No. That item of \$50,000 was ear-marked. My honourable friend says the English-speaking Canadian is being attended to. I am delighted to hear it.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We have quite an organization in the United States, extending from the Rockies to the East, directed by an English-speaking Deputy Minister of Immigration. But we have a staff in the New England states, organized specially to reach the French Canadians in an effort, in co-operation with the provincial Government, to bring back as many as possible of those French Canadians who lately have crossed over, by offering them some advantages. When my honourable friend speaks of that \$50,000, he refers to that special organization; but, as I