

committee of members of this House and not before any special standing committee which I doubt meets once in a whole session. I doubt whether this committee has met yet this year, and I am pretty well satisfied that the meetings of this committee during the previous session were few and far between. If they are to meet as frequently in the future as they have met in the past, I must come to the conclusion that the motion as presented is a very innocuous one and is designed simply to afford some imaginative consolation to certain gentlemen in their ardent efforts to make the citizens in general believe that they are the leaders of thought is so far as liberality is concerned. We are all seeking to do the greatest amount of good to the greatest number of people, and it is our duty to do all we can to relieve the needs of our fellowmen. But we are constitutionally established in such a way that we do very well when we attend to our own business. The duty of looking after the individual and the family is a matter which pertains essentially to the provinces, and I do not think we would be quite within our realm if we were to interfere with matters that did not pertain to our affairs.

In Quebec there has been no great anxiety in regard to lack of employment. As the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Morin) has stated, if anybody wants work, let him go to Bagot or to some other county throughout Quebec and he will find that he will get work right away. Nobody in this country has ever yet died of starvation. It is a thing unheard of in Canada and no one in this country is in such a state that he cannot live comfortably. Our province especially takes every care of indigents. We have institutions of every description to look after those who are in need, and I cannot see that it is at all necessary for us to make any profound study as regards the best mode of establishing insurance against unemployment. Those who are unemployed are generally those who are not thrifty, and those who are not thrifty are not going to contribute to an insurance scheme that is calculated to give them a salary when they lose the employment in which they are at the moment occupied.

It does not seem serious to propose that we should undertake a study to find out means of establishing an insurance scheme to get people who are not thrifty to contribute in order to provide them with just what they require as a result of their lack of thrift. The whole situation is most illogical, and if anything were to be done in order to improve the social state in this country, it would be put into some

more cogent form; it would be put into the hands of a certain number of gentlemen who understand this mode of insurance better and who could evolve something that would be for the benefit of the people in general. We have had too much of this socialistic doctrine served out to us in order to make us feel that there are some people who are really more inclined to be benevolent to their fellowmen than others.

Judging from the complexion of this House, I have no hesitation in saying that every hon. member here is prompted by the same feelings of benevolence, kindness, anxiety, and indeed worry over the welfare of his fellowman. I do not think it is necessary that we should get any lesson from a distant or an eccentric portion of our country to tell us what the rest of Canada has failed in doing ever since the foundation of this country. We are very sensitive people; we do not like to be criticized; we do not like to be given to understand that we are lax in doing our duty. We have always tried to do our duty as best we can, as fellow citizens of a great country. I am afraid that if we adopt what I may term a universal panacea for unemployment we shall attract those people who feel that they will be provided for whether they work or not.

The granting of doles is really the most baneful system that any country can put in operation. Unfortunately Great Britain instituted the system in response to the cry of the socialistic population following the post-war troubles. Hundreds of thousands of her people were without employment and in indigent circumstances, and something had to be done. But a dole system is very soon abused, and to-day you will find in Great Britain that although various positions are advertised the opportunities for employment are not embraced by those in receipt of the dole; they prefer it to work. We do not want anything of that kind here.

The spirit of internationalism does not appeal to me at all. We have had too much of that spirit evinced throughout the country, particularly in the city of Montreal. On the 1st of May every year our internationalists parade the streets singing anthems in praise of the blessings of internationalism. They never think of hoisting the Union Jack; they prefer to carry the red flag of anarchy, of disorder, of disunion—and we are supposed to stand by and admire it.

I am anxious indeed to see some form of legislation to provide for our indigent people, but I am very much opposed to anything of a socialistic character being enacted which will deceive our people and moreover deceive pros-