

*Embargo on Russian Goods*

them to take this attitude in Quebec. I give that dare beginning with the noisy senseless one and ending with the noiseless noisy ones. This fight is not a new thing in the province of Quebec, it is as old as the eternal battle between good and evil. If hon. members desire to be sarcastic and call this a mere gesture, I reply that it is only our duty to set an example to the world. As Christians, as Canadians, as a civilized people we should have nothing to do with a nation of murderers and atheists. If this government had done nothing else it would deserve the approval and gratitude, not only of Canada but of the whole civilized world. Hon. members say that we had no mandate to take this action, but let them get up and condemn this so-called gesture. The Catholic hierarchy has approved of it and our mandate as christians is imperative. They will not get up and condemn this openly, but by coming in the back door they try to minimize it by sarcasm or ridicule. Let them come straight to the question.

I am a member of a race which has been in this country for three hundred years. We have been taught to respect authority, to respect the king, to respect the law and to believe that wealth is necessary and should not be looked upon with hatred, jealousy and envy. Do hon. members believe they are going to settle this social question by teaching hatred and envy? Every man is equal, but when? Not until death. Everyone has not the wonderful health of the hon. member for Beauce. Everyone has not an equal amount of wealth.

Mr. LACROIX: The hon. member should not be jealous.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I am not jealous why, my capital has not got to go begging the janks on the eve of fortune, but I do not contend that we should look upon wealth with envy. My only capital is my honour and I would not exchange that for all the wealth of any hon. member.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): You remind me of a person who, having lost his political standing in 1911, is endeavouring to recover it.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I am sorry the hon. member does not understand what I am saying.

Mr. DENIS: I will repeat my remarks in the English language.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I think I understand the French language as well as does the hon.

[Mr. LaVergne.]

member. I rose in my place to restate and to reaffirm my confidence in the government and the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) in having passed this order in council. Jacques Cartier, a Frenchman, came to this country four hundred years ago and planted a cross on the shores of Gaspé. That cross is still there and as long as I have breath in my body and blood in my veins it shall remain.

Amendment (Mr. Bourassa) negatived.

Motion (Mr. Bennett) agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

## SUPPLY

## DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

Civil government—Fisheries, salaries and contingencies, \$212,860.

Mr. DUFF: I notice an increase of \$1,000 in the salary of the deputy minister. Will the minister explain that?

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Fisheries): Unless one were to say that the work of the Department of Fisheries were less important than that of other departments and the consideration less important, I can see no good reason why the salary of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries should not be placed in line with those of deputy ministers of other departments. Having in mind the importance of the fisheries, the importance the government attaches to it, I felt that this office ought not in the matter of salary to be placed in a position inferior to that of similar offices in other departments of government.

Mr. DUFF: If the minister's argument is good, the amount should be \$10,000 instead of \$8,000. The salary should be the same as that, for instance, of the Deputy Minister of Finance, or of the Deputy Minister of External Affairs. The only objection I have is that this year, when we are talking about economy, when conditions are not as they should be, when, as the Minister of Finance said this afternoon, we are going to have a deficit of something like \$75,000,000, is not the right time to increase the salary of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries. It must be remembered that only two years ago this gentleman was receiving a salary of \$6,000. Last year the government increased it to \$8,000, and now there is another increase of \$1,000. Under the circumstances \$8,000 should be sufficient for this position.

Mr. RHODES: If the question is one of economy, I may say to my hon. friend that we have saved this amount several times over