

automatically solve all our problems—unemployment, national debt and railway deficits. For my part, I hesitate to accept the proffered panacea, and my hesitation arises out of an incident with which I am personally familiar. It happened in my own little town of Tecumseh, and what I am about to state can be verified by reference to the files of the municipality. A few years ago an English family came into the town. The head of the family, an old war veteran and ex-member of the Imperial army, was badly crippled and absolutely unfit for any kind of work, his wife was sickly and his four children were tubercular. A few weeks later his mother-in-law crossed over from Detroit. She was supposed to be in receipt of a pension, but after a few weeks it ceased. Later she developed cancer, and the municipality had to order her removal to a hospital and assume the expense. Then the head of the family had to be taken care of in the same institution. Thereupon the municipality was faced with the problem of sending the four children to a preventorium at a cost of between \$800 and \$900 a year. Eventually the municipal authorities had to take what may appear to be drastic action, but I commend them for doing so. They had to deport the family to the Old Country at a cost of \$600, and thus saved the ratepayers further expense. I wonder that such a family was ever allowed to enter the Dominion. It is a lamentable case, but it is typical of what may happen if we do not take some action to deal with our immigration problem. There is no room for sentiment in discussing the question, particularly in view of the financial difficulties through which most of our municipalities are passing at the present time.

I read in the press a few days ago a letter from a high official of the British Legion in Canada complaining about the Imperial Government's utter lack of attention to British soldiers in the Dominion who were members of the Imperial army during the Great War. I suppose some of my honourable friends have also read that letter.

In conclusion, may I say that, irrespective of the problems which are confronting this country at the present time, for instance, the problems of unemployment—so ably treated by my honourable friend from Winnipeg South Centre (Hon. Mr. Haig) a moment ago—and the financial distress of our municipalities, I think the most important duty on the part of the Government of Canada to-day is to work out such a unification plan as will remove all causes of friction in any part of the Dominion, and so take away the slightest justification for secession talk. Quebec is not the only province talking secession. We have heard

Hon. Mr. LACASSE.

of an agitation for the constitution of the island of Vancouver as a province; we have also heard it suggested that the three provinces by the sea should unite and withdraw from Confederation; again, we have heard a threat of secession from this province of the northern part of Ontario. So we should not be unduly scandalized by talk of secession here and there. It seems to be a general trend of mind which has developed because there is lacking in Canada a real national sentiment, which, I submit, is the true expression of Canadian patriotism. Therefore let us all work towards national unity if we want—and I ask honourable senators to regard this as a serious warning on my part, for I know what I am talking about—if, I say, we want Confederation to endure.

Hon. ARTHUR SAUVE (Translation): I do not propose, in my brief observations, to go into matters that could be more appropriately discussed on the occasion of the debate on the budget, on estimates or on motions. How, indeed, can the question of armaments be raised in a debate on the Speech from the Throne, which makes no mention of it?

It is rather strange, though, that it is not mentioned, when one remembers that, some time before the opening of the session, the Minister of National Defence made certain statements on the subject which gave rise to controversy. What meaning are we to attach to his former loquacity and his present silence?

It is the Government's duty frankly to state their policy in the matter of defence or participation. The Government are in communication with the authorities of the British Empire and with the member powers of the League of Nations. They were competently represented at the last session of the League, and I take the opportunity of congratulating the Government leader on his activity at Geneva. The Government thus being fully apprised of the situation, both national and international, it is their duty to bring forward in full frankness policies destined to meet this situation. The Government are aware of the country's role, of its interests, its obligations and its commitments. They also know their own responsibilities. They should therefore bring forward their policy. It will be the opposition's duty to examine it, to propose amendments, and then Parliament will decide. That will be the occasion to take a courageous and loyal attitude, loyal to Canada first.

There is also a question of education involved. The Government should seek to educate Canadians in their duties of citizenship, and it is in peace time that citizens will