

west to burn up their factories and carry off their wealth. We are just as law-abiding as they are, and we are just as serious in putting our industry on as sound a business basis as we already realize they have done with theirs. All we ask is an equalization of opportunity; in other words, we want equal rights for all and special privileges for none.

What I would like hon. members to know, who think that the farmer has no grievance, is that there is too great a discrepancy between the prices the Canadian farmer receives and the prices he has to pay for what he buys. Nobody will kick about 75 cents a bushel wheat if shoes are down to \$2. We realize that laws will not do everything for us—and I am sure this year's budget will not—so we are beginning to do things for ourselves. We have learned how, by cooperation and education, to avoid exploitation by middlemen. We are striving to put our farming on a business basis and we hope to see the time when we can make business-like decisions on our own initiative.

I repeat, therefore, that all the Canadian farmer asks is the same right which other Canadian industries now enjoy, through their superior organization, to name a price in the first instance, and to acquire an organization which will secure to him the same power to maintain that price. This we are striving to do, mostly through personal initiative, and partly through legislation; and this is my idea of the noblest way of "bringing home the bacon".

I should now like to deal with the question of immigration, especially in the light of what has been said during this budget debate. No one seems to oppose immigrants coming into this country, but they do question the method or manner in which they are brought here. I for one, deep down in my heart feel that we need more people here, and I am courageous enough to say that I do not oppose immigration. This country is big enough and good enough to contain three times its present population. There is one thing certain about the position of a member of parliament, and that is that he never lacks for material of all shades of opinion. Thousands of pounds of mail in the shape of letters, pamphlets, magazines, books and newspapers reach the members during the session for their information or misinformation. Yesterday I received a copy of the Montreal Star containing an article marked with a blue pencil, on the failure of our immigration policy. The whole argument is so much in line with what our Conservative friends have to say on this subject that I am intrigued into quoting a part of it:

It is an extravagant and cruel folly to entice people to come to this country and to leave them stranded here without means of earning their livelihood.

I am in complete accord with that part, but it goes on to say that only through a protective tariff policy can we get immigration. With that I am not in accord. Some one has said that our immigration policy is very analogous to the famous old rhyme:

"Will you walk into my parlour,"
Said the spider to the fly,
"It's the prettiest little parlour
That ever you did spy."
But if the fly was wise
He never would go in;
He would know very well
There was nothing there for him.

I know a case where some false representation has had beneficial results in the end, but this is an exception to the rule, and in any case it could never work out in the same way to-day. I know a district in Alberta where a settler who came here thirty years ago felt quite lonely because he was there all alone. He wanted more of his own villagers to settle there with him so he wrote back home saying that Canada was a most luxuriant country where everything from hay to coconuts, peaches and bananas grew in the greatest abundance. It was not long after that letter was received away back home in the old country that that whole village became depopulated, for they all sold out and came to Alberta. Of course at first they were all sorely peeved, but being a very hardy race they soon adapted themselves to conditions here, and to-day they are among Alberta's best settlers. I have said that this is an exceptional case and should not be followed as a general rule by the immigration authorities.

I object again to the commercialization of immigration, which enriches a few individuals at the expense of the country. Immigration should be controlled by the Dominion and not delegated to private individuals or associations. The Dominion should select the immigrant and when he gets here should see that he is properly placed.

I do not believe in paternalism or a spoon-fed immigration. I know from experience with immigrants in the past that those immigrants who had the least means and help were the ones to make the best success; while those who came here in comparative luxury are now virtually begging off their more prosperous neighbours. I say emphatically that paternalism is a vicious animal which will finally turn upon and bite its master. This is no country for mollycoddles; what we want is the hardy red-booded pioneering type that