

specialist in building up Canada the hon. the Minister of Immigration does not know what he is talking about. The minister cannot build up a great prosperous life on the western prairies by pumping wheat growers and still more wheat growers into the provinces between the boundaries of western Ontario and the Rockies. Feed the needs of the west on that sort of free trade diet and wheat will become so abundant the crop will not be worth 75 cents a bushel and the wheat growers of western Canada will be where the cotton growers of the United States are to-day, doomed to grow and sell wheat at less than the cost of production.

That will be the result of the policy of the hon. member for Brandon and his followers, and of the hon. gentlemen to my left who call themselves, U.F.A.'s, U.F.B.'s, U.F.O.'s and all the way down the alphabet, but in my opinion they are all Liberals. I notice that the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail), a young lady for whom I have the utmost regard and respect, has been deliberating on what side of the House she will sit. Nine hundred to a thousand Conservative voters voted for that splendid young lady under the belief that she was an independent and would exercise her independence in parliament for the benefit of the country generally, but on looking over the records I find that except in one instance she has always voted for the Liberal party in the past two parliaments. My experience in the last three parliaments is that the U.F.A.'s, the U.F.B.'s, the U.F.O.'s and the other letters of the alphabet, are Liberals first, last and all the time. There is really no necessity for any of our Progressive friends to hesitate as to where they will sit. In fact I am sorry that the other side of the House has not sufficient benches to seat the overflow of Progressive members on that side, where they all politically belong.

This United States first policy of "tariff uncertainty," dooms other Canadians to appoint themselves ambassadors at their own expense to search in a foreign land for the jobs that they cannot find in their own country. The great industrial system of the United States was built up on the principle of protection. In the early days of Horace Greeley the opportunities for employment in the United States were threatened by imports from Europe as the opportunities for employment in Canada are to-day threatened by imports from the United States. The Americans asked their rulers for the bread of employment. These rulers did not offer their countrymen the stone of free trade theory. No, and these rulers did not require the founders of American industry to go before

a minstrel show of a tariff commission and persuade the interlocutor, the tambo and the bones who call themselves commissioners, that the tariff should be changed in favour of industries that would employ Americans in their own country instead of driving these Americans as Canadians are being driven to seek employment in a foreign country.

This parliament was summoned to Ottawa to consider proposals for the improvement of conditions in this country. The 432,000 Canadians who have been driven from their native land since 1921 are only part of the story. The other part is the work of that other "Excellency," Right Hon. P. C. Larkin and his anti-emigration officials at London. Until we have a pro-immigration policy of protection at Ottawa, we can have no jobs to keep our own Canadian-born workers at home, we can have no jobs to attract other British-born workers to these shores. The big part of immigration problem is a problem of stopping emigration to the United States with jobs for Canadians in their own country. The other part of the immigration problem is the problem of starting immigration from the British Isles with jobs. How can we have immigration without jobs to employ the native-born Canadians who would like to stay here and the British-born workers who would like to come here? How can we have jobs when Canadian money goes to the United States at the rate of five hundred millions in wages to workers under the Stars and Stripes when that money should be kept in Canada to pay workers under the Union Jack? The whole policy of the hon. the member for Brandon's leader is a policy for the suppression of opportunity for employment of Canadians in their own country and the employment of British workers in Canada. The natives of this land that have given some wealth to the hon. member for Brandon, the natives of the isles that gave birth to the same hon. member never had a worse enemy than the hon. member for Brandon and his leader. The policy of these hon. members has proved itself a foe to the creation of jobs for our own people who vainly seek employment that would keep them in Canada or jobs that would bring them to Canada from the British Isles.

I said that the policy of the Prime Minister and the policy of the Minister of Immigration was a policy of enmity to the production of jobs for Canadians. I take back that statement, in part. The policy of these gentlemen has made Ottawa the seat of a great industry; that industry manufactures jobs for broken down politicians; the workings of that policy have made Canada a nation, yea, a nation of