

day. I heard the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Woods) speak about selling pork and fat cattle at \$3.50 or \$3.60 a hundred. I well remember those days when times were so hard that one scarcely knew where the next dollar was coming from. But conditions are difficult enough to-day on the farms. I come from one of the best counties in Ontario, where last year the harvest was the best we had had in fifty years, probably the best we ever had. But with the high taxes, with heavy overhead expenses and with everything we have to buy commanding top prices, even one good crop will not set the average farmer on his feet. I do think, however, that we are having better times now than we had in the late eighties or early nineties.

In 1911 the farmers of this country had the greatest opportunity that ever presented itself to them when the reciprocity pact was thrown into the political pot. But the pot boiled over and burned sixty-six per cent of the people of this country. And who was to blame? I say it was this ignoramus bunch of eighteen in Toronto—"the noble eighteen" as some people called them—they are the men who are largely to blame for Canada's position to-day. They spread over the country cartoons playing upon race and religion to such an extent that it was a shame and disgrace to this fair Canada of ours.

Hon. members to our right talk about stagnation of business and indulge in other kinds of political propaganda. But I ask them, why have three hundred thousand of our people crossed the border? Why are factories closed, if any are closed? Why is the labourer out of work? Why are the boys leaving the farms? Why have we, in this the most glorious country under the sun, such a tremendous debt? Perhaps I should not go back to the time of the Union government, but I do submit that, in the first place, daylight saving was the greatest curse this country ever saw; the resolution that was put through the House on that subject did more harm and made more lazy men than any other enactment that has ever been put on the statute book. The high financing of the war period was another curse to this country. While the young men of the land were called to the colours, our statesmen heaped one victory loan upon another and saddled the country with a staggering debt. Why did they not tax the men who stayed at home? In 1917 a man came to me and wanted me to go out collecting subscriptions for victory bonds. I refused point blank, and was asked the reason why. I said that if the finance minister of the day did

not raise part of the money as he went along instead of heaping one loan upon another, somebody else would have to get the subscriptions. Not only that; look at the amount of money that was raised at that time in tax-free bonds. If I had my way I would call in every dollar of those tax-free bonds to-morrow. Why did they not tax those firms that piled up fortunes while the men at the front were shedding their life blood; at a time, in fact, when we were taxing the men on service to the extent of one hundred per cent?

I have a criticism to offer against the present government for not tackling the civil service problem as I think they should have done. I am sure that if they took the proper steps in this matter they would be backed up to the hilt by the people. If the Civil Service Commission are not carrying out their duty, I would dismiss them. If the fault in any case is with the deputy and not with the commission, then I would dismiss the deputy. Think of the army of men and women in the civil service, nearly thirty-eight thousand, between twelve and thirteen thousand of them in the city of Ottawa, according to the figures for 1922. I think their numbers ought to be cut in two.

One hon. member stated this afternoon that he was in favour of there being fewer members in this House, and I support him in that view. I myself last year was in favour of cutting the number of members down by at least one-third so that we should have not more than one hundred and sixty members after the next election. I would also cut the number of senators down to the extent of two-thirds, if they cannot be cut out altogether—either one or the other. I do not see any use in increasing the number of members in this House. If I might make a suggestion, outside of the leaders of the government and their first two or three lieutenants, thirty minutes is all I would allow any member on the floor of the House.

Mr. PELLETIER: Make it twenty minutes.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): I would be satisfied to make it twenty. I think in that way we could save this country hundreds of thousands of dollars.

With regard to immigration, I think this is probably one of the biggest problems this government has to deal with to-day. I am not one of those who believes that we should not have immigration. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that immigrants will flow into this country by the thousands and tens of thousands every year. If we had twenty-five million people in Canada to-day, which we should have had