

application of the doctrine of protection will solve all the economic ills of the maritime provinces, and as one of the members of Ontario I will support the general principles of the Duncan report.

I believe that the people of central Canada, especially Ontario—and no province is suffering so much to-day from economic ills—will support active aid to the maritimes as a necessity. We certainly need a ginger group in this House for Ontario, to dwell on Ontario's economic ills also, which are acute. The people of the province of Ontario believe in the confederation doctrine of all for each and each for all. That is the doctrine which should rule this country in any modern confederation. I may say that if confederation cannot be made a commercial success in the maritime provinces, the people of the maritime provinces must be in a very bad condition. The people of the maritimes for more than forty years put their trust in the idol of free trade and in the interests of Montreal greed. The maritime provinces allowed the incompetence of free trade rulers at Ottawa from 1896 to 1911 and the incompetence of corporationist free traders in at Halifax 1882 to 1924 to fritter away their opportunities for growth and prosperity and give away their public assets. The incompetence of private ownership greed in Montreal with some assistance from the same forces in Toronto butchered the great possibilities of the maritime provinces in the production of coal, iron and steel and in the production of power. I believe it is the duty and the mission of the Conservative party to revive and extend the good old national policy and apply those ideals as the hydro Conservatives of Ontario applied those ideals. The principles of the national policy forbid us to come here to serve the local needs of the sections where we live. The principles of the national policy require us to come here and think and vote in the spirit of the old Cornish battle cry, "Each for all and all for each." That is the battle cry of the national policy breed of protectionist as opposed to the battle cry of the hon. member for Brandon his leader and his followers, whose policy has emptied nearly five hundred thousand Canadians out of their own country since 1921, the semi-free traders who fight under the banner of a tariff uncertainty that is worse than free trade, the star-spangled music of the war cry, the United States for Canada and Canada for the United States. That is the kind of protection I would apply to the various provinces of confederation. We have no jobs to keep our own Canadian born at home. The greatest problem of the

immigration policy is to devise a scheme to stop the emigration to the United States, which has amounted to nearly half a million Canadians since 1921.

That is the first corner stone in the immigration policy. Instead of forcing our own Canadian born citizens to go to the United States we should supply them with jobs in our own country. This can be done by developing our natural resources and our raw materials, thus preventing nearly half a million of our citizens leaving for the States every year. We are losing all those wages which now go to the people of the United States. If we had a proper system of protection we would have enough work in our own country for our own unemployed, not only on the farms but in the urban districts.

Another phase of the immigration policy is the bringing of immigrants from the British Isles. Why should we bring immigrants from England to Canada if we have no jobs for them? Because we have not even jobs for the Canadian born worker. At the present time Canadian money is going to the United States at the rate of nearly \$500,000,000 a year. These workers are now living under the Stars and Stripes when they should be in Canada serving under the Union Jack. The policy of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) 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 hon. gentleman has done little or nothing in the matter of an immigration policy. Fancy this country having a free trader as a commissioner on immigration. How can there be any immigration under free trade? How can we furnish jobs for our working men under a policy of free trade? If we cannot supply jobs for the half million men who have gone to the United States, how in the name of heaven can we supply jobs for immigrants who come here under our policy of free trade.

I said that the policy of the right hon. Prime Minister and 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, an industry that manufactures jobs for broken down politicians. The workings of that policy have made Canada a nation—yea, a nation of ambassadors.

This government have stated that they have nothing to do with unemployment; that under the British North America Act unemployment is for the provinces and municipalities. We say to the government to-night that unemployment is a matter for the federal government