

That was the opinion of Mr. Marler, who was a very able member of this house. Under this system a private member, and especially a member of the party in power, is reduced to the status of a sort of glorified errand boy. I hope I may say this without giving offence, because I think we are all pretty much in the same position. A member can spend most of his time in Ottawa running errands to the various departments for his constituents, making an occasional speech on the budget and voting for all government measures. Surely no one would question the fact that we could get legislation more in the interests of the people if members of this house had the same opportunity of securing legislation as that enjoyed by members of congress, and I think it also safe to assume that the brains of parliament are not confined to the party in power and that the brains of the party in power are not confined to the cabinet.

If the system in the House of Commons is bad, that which obtains in the Senate is even worse. Members of that chamber are appointed not because of their ability but as a reward for services rendered to their party; they are appointed for life and are responsible to no one. They can block any legislation, with the exception of supply, and in the main they are representative of the reactionary element throughout the country. What chance have we to progress under these conditions? I consider this system to be at the root of many of our problems to-day. You may ask, "If this is the case why did not our people insist on changing the system?" The answer is because this system suits the parties, and the party leaders kept the people entertained with their discussions over the tariff and similar things. The older people were such ardent Liberals or Conservatives and were so engrossed in their party warfare that they never thought of improving the system, while the young people found it easier to cross the boundary line and secure a position than to stay here and fight against the disadvantages of such a system.

I would like to make it very clear that I am not advocating the adoption of the United States system of government. I have compared some features of their system with the Canadian system, because of the time which has been spent in this house comparing their tariffs and other matters with similar matters in this country; but I should like also to make it clear that I do want such changes made in our system as will give the representative chosen by the people power to initiate legislation, and to secure the removal from the hands of the Prime Minister of the

[Mr. Coote.]

power of dissolution of parliament. Let us get away from that worn-out tradition that the defeat of a government measure by the house should be followed by the resignation of the government or the dissolution of parliament. Personally I should like to see a fixed term of four years for parliament, but as that would necessitate a change in the British North America Act possibly we cannot get that in my lifetime, because we are told Ontario and Quebec oppose it.

If I have time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to compare the control of finance in the two countries, although I shall have to do so in about two minutes. In Canada four banks control approximately 80 per cent of the banking and credit business of the entire country, while in the United States every city and town has its own bank owned and controlled by men whose interests are centred in the community. Their bank can grow only as the community grows, so naturally they do their best to retain all the bright and capable young people in their own community. If we are concerned about keeping our young people in Canada why not reform the system of government and give the representatives of the people a chance to do something for them? Let us remodel our banking system to make it serve the needs of the people in the outlying parts of the Dominion as well as those living in the vicinity of Toronto and Montreal. In my opinion it will be hard to secure any effective change in the banking system of this country until we make some change in our system of government and in the rules of this house.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I am opposed to this budget because it will reduce the income tax, which I believe to be the best method we now have for the collection of taxes. I object to the reduction of the sales tax on certain articles which we class as luxuries. I also object to the proposal to double the percentage of empire labour and material cost required on goods receiving the British preference.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time.

Mr. DUNCAN SINCLAIR (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in opening my few remarks on the budget and the amendments thereto I wish to congratulate you on your re-election as Speaker of this house, and I hope that on this, my first attempt to speak, I shall have your kindly sympathy. I promise faithfully that I will be under the wire before the flag falls. I also wish to thank hon. members on both sides of the house for their kindness to myself since coming here. Like the old Scottish preacher who once said in opening