

it cannot be said that it is so done at the present time. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that our little group—which I am confident will not long be as small as it is at present—will render all the assistance it possibly can to the end that the debt of the Dominion may be reduced and satisfactory conditions brought about.

Mr. MORPHY: In regard to direct taxation, may I ask the hon. member whether he would tax improved or unimproved lands?

Mr. MacNUTT: My idea is that the land should be valued without taking into consideration the improvements upon it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said about all I intended to say. Probably at a later date, when the Budget is before the House, I may go further into details. I rose, however, more particularly to say that in the absence of some assurance that we may expect an election following the census I shall have no other resource than to vote for the amendment.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, the word "class" has been used somewhat freely in this debate. We have heard such expressions as, "class legislation," "class representation," and "class movement," and last evening the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) spoke about "class origin." I am no advocate of class legislation or class representation. I am not at this moment condemning the principle, which may be necessary in some cases, as for instance in the case of labour groups. As I say, however, I am neither advocating nor condemning it. As far as the supporters of the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture are concerned, there is no desire for class legislation. Distinctly, we are opposed to class legislation of any kind. Class legislation is not approved of by our group in this House, nor is it approved of by our platform or its supporters. Class representation is not asked for by our platform or by this group in the House; nor is it asked for by the majority of the supporters of this platform. It is true that in some places and communities even leaders have come out in favour of class representation; that is that they, being farmers, should elect farmers to represent them. That view, however, is not general. In so far as Saskatchewan is concerned, we have come out very pronouncedly in opposition to class representation as well as class legislation. I think that in speaking of

this group, or, in any criticism that may be offered with reference to this group, that matter should be considered. It must be remembered that while there are twelve seats held by the group of which I speak, seven of the members in the group represent Saskatchewan constituencies where the policy has been distinctly laid down and agreed to that there must be no class representation or class legislation. Every person is free to come in and take part in our nominations or in any convention that is going on. Every one is free, no matter what his occupation is, to be a candidate or a delegate or to take part in a convention or in the work of the organization. I have said that it is possible that some group may find it wise to ask for class representation and may perhaps be justified in doing so; I am not saying whether they are or not; but I want to repeat that the movement which has been spoken of here—the movement of those who are supporters of the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture—makes no distinction whatever as between classes and does not ask for class representation or class legislation. Our platform is big and broad enough for every man who desires to promote the welfare of the country. That is all that is required. Every one who is desirous that all should have equal rights is welcomed by our organization and our platform is certainly broad enough to accommodate all who take that view.

This matter has become somewhat mixed in the utterances of public men and some of the papers. Some people have got the question of class representation and class legislation mixed up. There was a very earnest effort on the part of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) last evening to mix up the question of class origin with class representation and legislation. He claimed that because this movement had been started by a certain class it must therefore be a class movement. I have much respect for my hon. friend's arguments and his ability, as I think every member of this House has, but when he attempts to tell us that because a movement is started by some class, or some person of some class, it must therefore be a class movement and must be a movement of that class, with all respect to my hon. friend, I think his proposition is absurd. If there were anything in it, then because Carey was a cobbler, the missionary movement must be a class movement and a cobbler class movement at that. I do not know what the occupation in life of Cob-