

not understand just what he meant, having already one Minister of Immigration, but it struck me all at once that it was not immigration he had in mind, but emigration. He wanted the Minister of Immigration at Halifax or Montreal to count the immigrants coming in, and a Minister of Emigration at Windsor or Niagara Falls to count them going out—and the Minister of Emigration, I believe, would be the busier of the two.

The protective policy which I, am advocating for the woollen industry is the policy which will prevent people from leaving this country by providing employment for them in Canada, and thus rendering unnecessary the appointment of a Minister of Emigration.

Speaking of the problem of unemployment. I have been surprised, as a new member of this House, and also greatly struck by the character of the comment which comes from the supporters of the government. I heard the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) advocating government assistance for the unemployed in and around Winnipeg. Now the unemployment must be quite noticeable when a member of this House pleads for aid. On the other hand, I heard the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Howard) make the remarkable statement that times were prosperous, and that they were building a couple of factories in Sherbrooke to employ around four or five hundred hands. I would like to ask the hon. member what class of goods are to be manufactured in these factories, and also what protective tariff they will have on their goods. I believe they have a factory in Sherbrooke closed now because they can import goods from Germany cheaper than they can manufacture them. Would the hon. member for Sherbrooke be averse to a tariff that would open up that factory and shut out German goods, even if it was 35 per cent or more?

Mr. HOWARD: Will the hon. member please name any factory in Sherbrooke that is closed or that has closed down in the last five years?

Mr. CHAPLIN (Kent): The hon. member told me himself, in the Chateau Laurier, of one factory in Sherbrooke that had closed down, because the people were buying goods from Germany instead.

Mr. HOWARD: I did not make any such statement.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Kent): The hon. member for Sherbrooke, when speaking in this debate, gave the best and most concrete argument in favour of protection. His speech

[Mr. A. D. Chaplin.]

was notable for two reasons: first, the great volume of sound, which reminded one of the steamboat on the Mississippi with a seven horse-power engine and a ten horse-power whistle—every time the whistle blew the engine stopped. Second, he gave the best argument one could use for the Conservative national policy of protection. He stated that a factory in Sherbrooke making hose was selling its products at the same price as that at which they were being sold in the United States, although they had a tariff of 35 per cent. That clearly shows that they were not taking advantage of that tariff. But the hon. member did not say that the competition came from Canadian plants, and not from factories outside this country. That internal competition is exactly what is advocated by the Conservative policy.

It is an unfortunate fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have too much unemployment in this country. This is shown very clearly by the fact that in the last few years 500,000 of our people have been admitted to the United States and have paid the head tax, to say nothing of those who slipped in without paying that head tax, which would raise the number to probably 700,000. Now, Sir, supposing these 700,000 had refused to go to look for work in the United States. Would the hon. members still say that there was no unemployment in this country? They had jobs here once. Where have their jobs gone? On top of all this, we hear of the great "wave of prosperity" which is spreading over the country. This wave of prosperity seems to be based on the reports of our wonderful exports, and how they so greatly exceed our imports. But the man out of work with a family to support says in regard to these export statistics: They may be good food for the brain, but they are not much good for the stomach.

The Liberals cry aloud in this House and in the press when five or ten thousand of our people come back from the United States, but when the five hundred thousand of our people left this country, paid head tax and entered the United States, they wept not. It seems to me that the business of this government is the closing of factories. Dun and Bradstreet's will show that. They also seem to make it their business to buy goods from the United States rather than in Canada, as our import statistics will show. Further, I would like to draw the attention of this House to what the government is doing in regard to supplying members of this House with articles of everyday use. If hon. members will look at the penholders on their desks, or at the