

But, after all, there is another factor in the problem. Of two Canadian citizens born and brought up in Canada one may be 100 per cent efficient and the other 50 per cent. Which is of the greater service in production and the upgrowth of the country? Efficiency must be considered as well as numbers. People who are fully efficient produce better results than twice as many others only 50 per cent efficient. In order to conserve the efficiency of the people who have been brought up in our own atmosphere we must make the conditions of life agreeable to them. That involves health considerations and a variety of other factors, and the effect of policies of either the federal or the local governments bears mightily upon the solution of the problem.

To leave out all other factors for the sake of brevity, one of the things that militate strongly in favour of the conservation of our citizenship as we have it within the country, and that bear also upon the productivity of the race as far as our native population is concerned, is the proper sort of economic conditions. They should be made as favourable as possible, so that in the first place a man may be induced to raise a family, and in the next place his family may be kept around him, or at least within the country. There comes in the question of employment. Now, you are not a free trader and I am not a protectionist as I am arguing this matter to-day: we are common citizens of Canada, one just about as good as the other, all things being taken into consideration. Let us argue out this question. Is it not reasonable that the parents of a family should have some assurance that when their children have grown up they will be able to enter upon some employment which will provide them with a substantial sustenance for the future?

We talk a great deal about farmers' sons leaving the farms and going into the cities. That condition prevails now to an extent perhaps greater than before. No year will pass in Canada in which you will not have that problem with you. It was very well stated by my honourable friend the other day. If a farmer has a family of four boys and a farm of two or three hundred acres, can those four boys remain upon that one farm and marry and bring up families? Is it possible for that farmer to provide three farms for three of the boys and leave to the other the paternal property? That is difficult, perhaps impossible. So you may preach on that subject until you are as old as my honourable friend from Rougemont (Hon. Mr. Desaulles)—who looks as if he is going strong for another half century; you may talk about

it, but there is a condition which is present with us now and will be present more and more. Add to that the further fact that to-day, owing to mechanism skilfully invented and applied, one man upon a farm can do as much as two or three men in the olden times. Even with the extension of farms into lands that are not yet tilled and with the opening up of new farms, each individual farmer of to-morrow and the day after will be able to produce as much as was produced in the olden times by three or perhaps four farmers.

You must provide something, must you not, for those boys who do not want to farm, and for those who cannot because they have no farm? If we can provide some employment for them we shall retain them; and if we do not provide employment we shall lose them, because to-day, with the facilities for intercommunication, they can hop off to the country to the south of us, as people have been hopping off for years and years, and will to a certain extent for years to come. That hopping off process can be retarded, if not eliminated, only by some kind of employment being found in occupations other than farming for that surplus of population. Now, I am not a protectionist and you are not a free trader: we are on common ground. If there is any policy by which the resources of the country can be developed and utilized so as to provide employment for that surplus, is not such a policy the one to adopt, and are you not kicking against the pricks, and ineffectually, so long as by mere argument you simply uphold one theory or denounce another? The practical point is, can we get employment for that surplus of our population? If we cannot provide it they will seek it elsewhere, and they will send back to us, as the products of their brawn and skill, and at a higher price, the very things which they might have produced here for our consumption if only the capital and the industry could have been provided in this country.

Someone tells me that last year 1,500,000 cords of pulpwood were exported from Canada, and that if it had been manufactured in this country into the various products into which wood may be converted it would have produced a value of \$70,000,000 instead of the \$15,000,000 value at which it was exported.

We have water-powers, we have capital, we have brawn and skill and adaptability. Why can we not adopt some policy by means of which we can bring our raw products, in so far as we must export them, up to the top-notch of value before they are exported? Why should they be brought back to this country in finished form at a value which is