

present state of affairs, expect this Government to give us a guarantee that they will introduce redistribution. As a matter of fact, if an election were held now, my own opinion is that there would be at least sufficient men of truly progressive views returned to enforce a considerable portion of their policy upon the House of Commons or to force a fight on it.

We of this party are in earnest, Mr. Speaker. In saying this I do not suggest that others are not also in earnest. But, I repeat, we are in deadly earnest. We believe that the economic views we hold are vital to the well-being, the progress, and the prosperity of this country. We agree with Mr. Asquith, who has just won an extraordinary by-election, fighting almost exclusively on his economic and fiscal views as being necessary to save the Old Land at this time. We hold our views with equal tenacity and strength, and we believe they will prevail. If there were an unbalanced state of opinion in this Chamber, then we might be on the eve of another election before a redistribution Bill was carried. Many people think we are in for a series of short governments and short parliaments in this country. Now, I mention these matters only to make myself clear, that if we could have a guarantee that redistribution would come before an election it might alter our attitude on this question. I have not the least doubt that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Sifton), and my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) will fight hard in the Cabinet for that view. It is both their interest and their duty to do it in the Cabinet provided this amendment is not carried. But we can have no guarantee that they will be able to pull the Cabinet their way. As a matter of fact, what has happened in the past in that respect? I am speaking from memory, but I think I am correct in saying that in the early years of Confederation redistribution was twice at any rate carried on the eve of an election. But since that time the East has had the pull. Political considerations have prevailed, and it has rather been the tendency to have an election before redistribution. Human nature is human nature, whether East or West, and I have no confidence that my hon. friends, pull as hard as they may, will be able to keep their colleagues right on this question. As I say, I shall vote for the amendment on grounds of public policy. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was very em-

[Mr. M. Clark.]

phatic last night in directing to my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, the question, What is wrong with this country? I have tried to answer that question in so far as the finances of the country are concerned as my leader answered it before the minister spoke along that and many other lines last evening. But if the question is put seriously—and I say this not along the line of cheap party warfare—should it be directed to the leader of the Opposition; or could my hon. friend not direct it more properly elsewhere? I do not think the Government have any conception from their utterances of the extent to which public opinion is moved on political questions in this country. What is wrong? What was wrong in Assiniboia? There was no Government candidate, but does anybody for a moment conceive that the presence of a Government, or an Opposition, candidate would have made any difference as to who would win that seat? What was wrong in Carleton, N.B.? These are the places to which to direct this question.

What is stirring in the minds of the people? What are the people thinking? Are their thoughts all complimentary to Unionist Government or do they not follow the thought that was so earnestly and eloquently urged by my hon. friend from Marquette last evening when he said that great questions are stirring the minds of the people of this country and will continue to stir them until they are settled along the lines of democracy, freedom and justice.

My hon. friend should ask the veterans what is wrong with this country. The speech from the Throne takes note of the fact that unrest and disquiet prevail all over the world while claiming, it is true, that Canada is more exempt than other countries from disturbance. Why is it that this class have been heard in this House; or why is it that the farmers are rising in a way they have never risen before and are combining with other men of progressive views? What is moving them? It is a world movement. The movement is bigger than any group and it is bigger than any party in this country has any idea of or any man may guess. It would have been strange if it had been otherwise.

What is wrong with this country?—my hon. friend asks. What is wrong with the workmen, what is wrong with the farmers, what is wrong with the veterans? I will tell my hon. friend—it is the sense of injustice. That is what is wrong. Let him go to the rank and file of the veterans and