

Finance (Mr. Dunning)? I was not present last week, but I should like to know if there have been laid upon the table the orders in council which provided for the royal warrants that have been issued to deal with a situation which has arisen in this country. We told him that he would have to have similar authority, but no, perish the thought, the institutions of the country would be wrecked; there must be an appropriation! The government reappropriated all the moneys that had been provided for public works and buildings. The Minister of Labour came down and reamended his own statute in order to make it work. We still pointed out to him where he would end up. Now we have royal warrants for expenditures.

If they had stopped there it would not be so bad, but they did not. They have had recourse to very many other orders in council in order to achieve their ends. I name this too because it affects vitally a great principle. If the government of the day were sincere when they were in opposition during the long days and weeks they held up parliament and declared that this pernicious principle should not be embodied in a statute, why have they had recourse to the methods I have mentioned for the purpose of achieving the ends I have suggested? But it did not end there.

The speech from the throne states that they have made another trade agreement. In principle they have made one with Great Britain. If this story had been taken down on a dictagraph and transcribed it would make very nasty reading. The Prime Minister will perhaps recall that in the days long since passed he declared in this very city, when stating the platform of his party, that the British preferential tariff would be fifty per cent of the Dunning budget rates. The Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) looks up and recalls when he led the remnant of a third party in western Canada and clamoured loud and long and vigorously for a fifty per cent British preference. Have they got it? Is that the principle accepted? It is not very sound parliamentary practice to refer to a matter in the speech from the throne as being settled in principle when hon. gentlemen opposite are not able to give us any information with respect to its finality. But I apprehend that that time will not be far distant, and then we shall have an opportunity of testing in the light of known facts the professions made by the hon. gentleman when they were in opposition. Oh what a change, my countrymen, there will be!

[Mr. Bennett.]

There is one matter, however, Mr. Speaker, that I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not refer to—the advantageous effects of the trade agreement with the United States. There never was any difference of opinion, provided the benefits were not overborne by the disadvantages. I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite can realize how different this country is from other parts of the British dominions. Our geographical position has imposed upon us certain invisible influences that cannot be weighed in their value in relation to the national life of this country; the wireless operations, the close contact of newspapers and—I repeat what I said last session—the influence of magazines. We endeavoured for two reasons to lessen the distribution in this country of magazines from the United States. I shall not do more than merely refer to those reasons. One was for the purpose of being fair to the Canadian producer of manufactured products, and the other was that we should develop a national spirit. I am one of those who, unfortunately perhaps, believed that Canadians had a mission to develop a very distinctive civilization on the northern half of this continent. I believed that we were the interpreters of great conceptions of citizenship, of high regard for what one might call the elementary rules of justice and of obedience, of discipline and of loyalty, and that the opportunity offered to us was unique. I pointed out at the last session, as I have done in previous sessions, that the effect of the legislation which was passed by this parliament giving effect to the United States trade agreement was to increase the distribution of American magazines, of the type to which I referred, in Canada about 100,000 more than it was at their high circulation in 1930. That has happened in six months. The agreement came into force on January 1, and between then and now—it is not a year—the last figures, according to the National Bureau of Circulation, placed the distribution in this country in the vicinity of a million and three quarters of these magazines per month, per fortnight, or weekly, as they may be issued. What is the effect upon the national life of this country? Let hon. members ask themselves. In Canada we have only 11,000,000 people, endeavouring to create a distinctive personality among the peoples of the world. I need not mention the unfairness of this distribution of American magazines to our industrial life, because it imposes at once upon the Canadian reader, when he looks at our price standards, the view that he is being unfairly treated by the people to whom he