

and so forth. We have had enough economics in this house to do me all my life. I never heard a discussion on economics that I could agree with anyway. I have studied economy in another way altogether, and I never knew anything about economics. Let me cite a few of these positions that are to be filled by the civil service commission. Men are wanted for work along such lines, as botanical surveys, fruit diseases, dairy research, soil research, fly-catchers, field husbandry, parasites.

I am one who has imported a great deal of stuff in my lifetime from Holland. I am not doing it very much now because, like everything else, somebody has stolen the business and you cannot get it back. The people of Holland are just as particular that their stuff leaves Holland in good shape as we are to receive it in good shape, and there is very little danger of any plant diseases coming from there. But the entomological branch examines every package that comes out of the box. I have no objection to that because it would be wrong to let any foreign insect that might do a lot of harm get into this country. But I certainly do not see why we need all these men at this particular time. Is business growing? Is our population growing? Is everything so good that we want to spend money? Or is this the pork-barrel? Or are these 115 people to help win the next election? Extravagance of that kind is the worst in the world and should be curtailed.

What I have said about cutting down the membership of the house and of the provincial assemblies I think should be done. Of course, I shall be told that the British North America Act will not allow it; that we can do nothing with the act there. But, Mr. Speaker, rules were made for people who do not understand very much, and we should change them all if they prevent us from doing what should be done.

Mr. J. S. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, I have been interested and intrigued by the uniformity and unanimity with which members have risen to congratulate their fellows who have deserved well of this house. It reminds me of a ceremonial Swedish banquet where, from the youngest member to the oldest, they pass in front of the dowager hostess and thank her for the meal they have enjoyed—"Tack fur mat. Tack, tack, tack fur mat. Tusend tack fur mat. Tack fur mat."

The hon. lady member for Grey-Bruce (Miss Macphail) feeling that it was becoming a little monotonous, sought to lump her congratulations together and delivered them in one great panegyric. I myself feel that at this

[Mr. Spence.]

late stage of the debate some change should be effected and so, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say it with flowers. For that reason I propose to hand to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Matthews) and the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Chevrier) pansies for thoughts, and rosemary for remembrance—thoughtful remembrance of their leader to new party members.

To the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. McLarty) some violets—violets for faithfulness—and a sprig of ivy in order that he may be zealous in his desire to please in his new office.

But there is also the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. MacKinnon), and to him more violets, for faithfulness, but also a lily, pure and white, and, since he will never be able to keep it in a portfolio, the kindly wish that he may keep it pure and help it to last as long as possible.

To the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Manion) roses, roses, plenty of roses, with a little sprig of fennel, so that he may have the loving flattery of his own party; and if the roses turn out to be blue ones, possibly that is just the colour the hon. member wants.

To the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Stevens) a sprig of rue, the herb o' grace, rue for repentance, circled round with many twigs of hazel representing the reconciliation and forgiveness of his friends.

And now, Mr. Speaker, that I have given away all my flowers, I want to record, socialist though I consider myself to be, the real sense of satisfaction which I experience from the fact that Their Majesties the King and Queen of Canada are going to see our country and to deepen by their act the symbolical significance of their place in the scheme of things. To me, sir, the evolution of a free society does not under any circumstances necessarily imply or compel the elimination of that continuing act that we call government. In this evolution government has become among democratic peoples a function of the people, entrusted by the people to representatives of the people, to act for the people. In the struggles of the peoples for freedom in the British democracies, the hereditary rulers have for all time forsworn their right personally to govern, and they have accepted a new and higher symbolical position and significance in their historical succession. As a result, to-day the soul of the people of Canada finds its living symbol in the peculiar person and functions of its king, the King of Canada, he in turn being honoured in his domestic duties by the presence and help of his gracious wife, the Queen of Canada. To-day in every part of