

and strenuous efforts our chief symbolizes the aspirations of the younger generation of Canada.

The young men and women of Canada are fed up with party politics as they have been played during the past eight days. More than fifty speeches have been delivered from the other side in order to prevent this government granting an additional sixty days to the municipalities and provinces to complete the works started to assist the unemployed. The young men and women of Canada are disgusted to hear hon. gentlemen opposite say, when we happen to laugh in this house for one reason or another, that we on this side are laughing at the sufferings of the people. They are amazed at seeing the leader of what was once a great party take thirty-one minutes of the time of this house to define the word "humbug" and eighteen minutes to define the word "demagogue". The young men and women are disgusted with such practices; they want men, they want leaders, they want action, they want order, discipline and security and this party is the only instrument whereby they can get what they hope for. The name of the Prime Minister Bennett forever will be associated in history with order, discipline and security. It will always be associated with the slogan "Canada First". "Canada First" has been proclaimed in Westminster as well as in Quebec city, Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg, and that will be the rallying cry of our party. The words "Canada First" embody all our social, economic and political aspirations. Because young men and women in Canada, love order, peace, discipline and security, they love Bennett, they follow him. And they follow Bennett because they love Canada.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to follow the last speaker in the amiable attempt he made to bring harmony into party strife. In his condemnation of party politics I am afraid he overlooked the fact that in the delivery of his speech in which he sought to castigate the party system he himself was possibly one of the most guilty. I wholly agree with him that there is nothing so futile or stupid as an attempt to carry on the public business under a party system which has shown that it is more interested in inter-party strife than in the affairs of the country. The last orator—I think I am entitled to call him that, for I have seldom heard such a flow of words from the lips of any hon. gentleman; showed his talent in excellently-studied language—was describing Bennettism. If I were one of his race and a member of his party I think

I should attempt to describe the present proposed legislation as an attempt to induce this House of Commons to give its "Bennettiction" to the laying of the corpse of constitutional liberty and of custom long established and approved. However, I do not think that language of that kind can be fittingly applied to this question.

There are several reasons why both sides of this house should not support the proposed introduction of the measure suggested. First, this resolution asks for greater powers than have ever been asked for in this House of Commons since the day it first exercised its functions as such. It asks for greater powers than were granted under the War Measures Act; it asks for greater powers than were granted under the war appropriations acts, in fact it asks for greater powers than were granted by all these acts combined. The second reason I have for objecting is that the procedure followed is utterly unnecessary. Parliament is sitting, as has been said time and time again; I simply repeat that in passing.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) defended the introduction and passage of this measure last year on the ground that we were about to prorogue and that an emergency faced both agriculture and labour. He stated that these matters could be dealt with in the intervening period only by the passage of legislation such as this. I disliked it and I disapproved of it last year; when I spoke on the question I pointed out that the introduction of the measure had been made necessary by neglect on the part of the administration to make the necessary plans and preparations to meet a crisis of which it had been forewarned during the earlier part of the session. We knew it was coming; it was inevitable and nothing could stop it. Yet the present government delayed taking action until the closing days of the session, when it placed this proposal before us and demanded that it be given the most amazing and extraordinary powers with regard to the voting of moneys and any other legislative action it might desire to take.

The third reason why I oppose this measure is that unquestionably it is an attempt on the part of the administration, supported by a supine majority, to take away from parliament the rights and duties which we have sworn to undertake. I am quite willing to admit at the outset that the unemployed man who is hungry and cold is not interested in constitutional questions. Heaven knows, there are many of these men. We have heard the protestations of hon. gentlemen opposite,