

hundred men; in at least one instance he recognized the government had been very hasty in its action and that the schedules had to be reconsidered. As a conclusion to the whole matter there was an editorial in the old Conservative newspaper, the Gazette, reviewing the whole matter under the very suggestive title, "A tragedy of errors."

We had another reason for resentment in the fact that the schedules were hurried through. Not only was this schedule put on the table in a state of unpreparedness but we were given no opportunity to discuss it. We were told very abruptly by the Prime Minister that we must either accept these items at once and put them through as they then existed or he would not go to the London conference. At the time we thought Canada should be represented at the conference. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that if we could have foreseen the policy which was to be propounded by the right hon. gentleman, the manner in which he would present it and the way in which he would be received, I am not so sure but that it would have been good business to keep him here a little longer. Time passes however and I am only too happy to avail myself the most admirable description of the Imperial conference which was given Monday last by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). The speech of my right hon. leader has shown not only why the blasting process of the Prime Minister failed so lamentably but also how the whole procedure of the right hon. gentleman was doomed to utter failure. The Prime Minister has said that he did nothing more than was done in 1902 by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. If he meant in a general way that at different times in the history of this country Canadian governments had sought preferences in the British market I will not deny his statement. I hope he does not intend however to parallel his action with the suave, diplomatic, mellow tone adopted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I hope he will not compare the blunt, aggressive and as he himself has called it, "brutal" way he addressed the Imperial conference with the manner adopted by the former leader of the Liberal party. It does not matter however whether his attitude was similar to that taken about thirty years ago when conditions were totally different, or whether he thought it best to present his case in that way or in some other way. The bare fact remains that he went to London in an effort to find a market for our wheat and he came back empty handed. That fact cannot be denied, Mr. Speaker. To quote a parallel incident

[Mr. Rinfret.]

which occurred thirty years ago does not in the least help the west to sell one bushel of wheat in the English market to-day. In my estimation the difficulty with my right hon. friend is that he puts too much faith in the policy of protection and in his own blunt way of presenting it. I think we must all admit that the problems facing the world to-day are over-production and under-marketing. The world has been producing too much and has not been able to get a wide enough distribution for that product. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, but that was not the problem in the year 1902. We must face the problem of 1931. The great need is not so much to increase home production as to dispose of our surplus products in the markets of the world. My hon. friends talk about a policy of high protection but when they propose to grant a preference to some one it means they are further protecting someone else. That is their idea of a proper fiscal policy for Canada, and they call it the Canada-first policy. We know that the Conservative party has always claimed a monopoly of patriotism. It was a great Conservative leader who said once, "A British subject I was born; a British subject I will die," as if he was the only person to whom these things were likely to happen. That hon. gentleman propounded a tariff policy and was pleased to call it a national policy insinuating that any other procedure in fiscal matters would be anti-national just because it did not happen to be the policy with which he agreed. We had a similar situation in 1911. At that time I was not very old but I have not forgotten the discussions which were reported in the Montreal Star during the reciprocity campaign. We remember reading the words "Under which flag will you live?" Who is going to contend seriously that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier had won the election of 1911 we would not still be living under the British flag? The same applies to the present situation. My right hon. friend has been pleased to call his policy the Canada-first policy. But who will deny that any statesman in this country has not primarily the interests of Canada at heart? This is not a matter of pronouncement, it is a matter of performance and the means to be employed. For myself I do not believe that a policy of high protection is a good Canada-first policy. I do not believe in placing Canada behind high and impenetrable tariff walls, expecting to sell to all the countries of the world and refusing to buy from any. That is not a Canada-first policy. That is a policy of Canada alone, Canada ignoring the rest of the world, Canada isolated from all the