

(Mr. Rowe), who has the honour of leading the Conservative party in the province of Ontario, give this house the views of the farmers of Ontario. Probably, however, there is some justification for his absence, he is busy, and I have no doubt he is concentrating on a measure which will equitably apportion certain school taxes in the said province. I am a new member of this house; I have not had much experience in politics, but I wonder whether it is possible that political expediency may have something to do with the attitude of the Conservative party on this matter. I am tempted to apply to the Conservative group a word that was applied by the poet La Fontaine to a cat which was hunting in very poor disguise. He said:

Ce bloc enfariné ne me dit rien qui vaille.

The "wait and see" policy which is being followed by the opposition is not very courageous, nor does it seem very frank. I might compare the attitude of the right hon. leader of the opposition with the attitude of a certain accused person who, when asked by the magistrate whether or not he was guilty, replied, "How can I tell whether or not I am guilty until I have heard what the witnesses have to say?"

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Mr. Speaker, the amendment now before the house reads as follows:

This house views with grave concern the startling increases of expenditure proposed by the government for purposes of national armament in contrast with the inadequate provision for the social security of all sections of the Canadian people.

The mover of the amendment (Mr. MacNeil) did not see fit to stop when his idea had been well expressed, and when he had expressed his views against an increase in armaments, in the following terms:

This house views with grave concern the startling increases of expenditure proposed by the government for purposes of national armament.

With that part of the amendment I am in accord, and would have been content to support it. But he complicated matters by connecting with the first part of the amendment another part dealing with social security and social legislation, that sort of socialism which is and has been advocated in and out of this house by members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. It will be noticed that both the mover and the seconder of the

amendment are members of that party. I am sure they are sincere, and I am sure they are not communists, but I feel that a great deal of what they say is of a nature to develop communistic ideas in the minds of some, and to encourage others who have graduated in the most advanced form of communism, to go ahead and operate among our people.

My views on social legislation are quite different from those of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. I should not want the moneys now allocated to armaments to be employed for the development or realization of the reforms preached by the party I have just named. Besides, this is a vote of want of confidence. It is evident that if the government were overthrown the Conservative party would have to assume office and the direction of the country. The expenses incurred would be very great, when we remember that during that party's last term of office, between 1930 and 1935, they increased the national debt by \$920,000,000.

I shall vote against the amendment now before the house, because I find fault with the last part of it. But I shall also vote against the estimates, when they come before the committee of supply, because I do not deem it expedient that the government should spend so much or increase the estimates to such an extent in one year.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a quality to be frank and outspoken. I say the impression should not go out to the public that I hold the view that the present government, and particularly the ministers from Quebec, are imperialists. I am sure they are not imperialists, any more than I am—and I am not an imperialist. I do not want the impression to go out to the public that the present cabinet, and particularly those members of it who are from Quebec, are in favour of Canada's participation in any imperial or European war, because they are no more in favour of our participating in such wars than I am—and I am not in favour of such participation. They simply wish to protect Canada against attack, and to increase the national defence estimates by \$15,000,000 for that purpose. That is their sincere point of view. My humble belief is that the \$15,000,000 increase is too much, and that is the reason for my dissent.

While I am on my feet may I fulfil another duty, in the name of justice. I wish to denounce a certain section of the press of the province of Quebec for the falsehoods, misrepresentations and sins of commission and omission which appear regularly in their pages with respect to the attitude of the present