

managed. The honourable gentleman forgot that it was war time and spoke of the large size of the Cabinet. He talked about a Cabinet of twenty members. What occurred in the Mother of Parliaments in England? In 1915 they had a Cabinet numbering twenty-four members, and in 1917 there numbered nearly ninety. These things are peculiar to war times and will right themselves.

In my opinion, we have had too many commissions at work in this country. Parliament is here to represent the people. In that connection, I am going to say something that perhaps you do not know. The Senate is to-day perhaps not the most popular institution in the country. I believe, however, that it can be made popular, and that it can be made exceedingly useful. When I suggest changes in this body, I am reminded of the men who used to come to the House of Commons to attend their first caucus. They stood up and told us what they were going to do. To hear them, one would have thought that we were fools. After they had been here a while they settled down and found that others had been there before them. I remember one particular case. A man, a big man, came to a caucus and told Mr. Borden, "If you do not do things right, I am going to vote against you." This was in the days of party Government. This gentleman sat two or three seats behind me in the House. Towards the end of the Session I went to him one day and said: "This is a fairly good Government, is it not?" He said, "Why?" I said: "At the first caucus you told us that if things were not done right you were going to vote against us, and on every division you have voted with us." Perhaps I am something like that man. I believe, however, that we adjourn too often and for too long periods. There is one subject at least with which I believe a large committee of the Senate could profitably employ itself for a considerable period of time. I am sure that a committee to consider our natural resources could do good work, work that would be in the best interests of the country. One hardly ever hears a public speech which does not contain some reference to the glorious resources of this country. I believe that if more work were done along the line I have suggested, the Senate would be well on the way to becoming more popular in the country.

I have already said that I was very much pleased with what had been done by the Union Government, and, in spite of the

Hon. Mr. SCHAFFNER.

criticism of the Opposition, I think that they have conducted the affairs of the country very much to the satisfaction of the people. They were unpopular, it is true; why? One reason, I think, was Conscription. The criticism has been made that the Government went to the country in 1917 and told the farmers that their sons would not be conscripted. Perhaps they did. I rather think that promise was made. Even supposing it was, there is just as much reason why a farmer's son should go to the war as anyone else. What was the condition when that promise was made? At that time production was just as important as sending men to the front, perhaps more so; but in April, May and June, 1918, as my honourable friends well know, the situation at the front was exceedingly serious. We were not at all too sure who was going to win the war. We felt very restless and uneasy. Under those circumstances, men became more important than production. As Sir Robert Borden said, "What is the good of production if we lose the fight?" We had to have men. When matters became so serious, notwithstanding the fact that the promise had been made not to conscript farmers' sons, the Government changed their minds or broke their promise, if you will, and in my judgment they were justified in doing so.

There is one matter in which I think the Government has failed during the last three or four years, namely, in securing money in the form of taxes from the wealthy corporations. I say that they have not sufficiently taxed the big interests and the moneyed men, I care not whether they be farmers or any other class. In this country that work has not been done as well in any sense as in the little colony of New Zealand or in Australia. If it could be successfully done there, I see no reason why it could not be done here, if proper efforts had been made.

A moment ago I spoke of the farmers' platform. They believe in direct taxation, but they do not believe in free trade. Mr. Chipman and his lieutenant told me, "No, we do not believe in free trade." They propose taking the duty off a few articles which they want. That is what I call the height of class legislation. I will just read from their platform:

And whereas the protective tariff has fostered combines, trusts and "gentlemen's agreements" in almost every line of Canadian industrial enterprise, by means of which the people of Canada—both urban and rural—have been shamefully exploited through the elimination of competition, the ruination of many of our