

you," and they were ruled out. What have we left? We have left a certain section of the official Conservative opposition in Great Britain. But what do they want the preference for in England? What do they want protection for? Their idea of securing a preference was to work out a scheme which would allow them to sell their goods in other markets. My right hon. friend has said to them, "Remember our preference is based on the Canada first policy." "Canada first," means that anything that can be produced and manufactured in Canada is not to come in. The only preference which could arise would be one which might result from the erection of still higher tariff walls. That is what my right hon. friend has called empire preference. Empire preference as outlined by my right hon. friend is this "Canada first" idea wrapped in tinfoil with a union jack pasted on the outside. That is all that it means. It excludes in the first place all possibility of commodities coming to this country from Great Britain if they can be produced or manufactured here. No matter what government is in office in Great Britain, so long as this offer of my right hon. friend stands in its present form no negotiations can be successfully carried on with the mother country.

Now, what about the word "humbug"? I do not know why my right hon. friend should have been so sensitive about the use of the word, unless he was caught on the raw, because after all it is a very mild expression. Some of the terms used by the right hon. gentleman himself when he was leader of the opposition with respect to the preference by the then administration were much stronger. As a matter of fact in the last regular session of parliament my right hon. friend criticized very strongly the government of which I happened to be the head. Did he use the word "humbug"? No, that was too mild an expression for him; he used the word "deception."

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, that is right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, an offensive term, and he incorporated it in a resolution introduced in this house. Yet when a member of the administration in Great Britain used the word "humbug" with respect to my right hon. friend's proposals he immediately sent a broadside to the British press directed against the British government as a whole, two columns of the London Times directed not against an individual minister but against the whole British government. He told the government of Great Britain that he had

waited a day or two to see if they would not dismiss the minister who had dared to criticize his proposals. In his view the government of Canada could not have further successful relations with the British government if that attitude was to be maintained. We came very near having complete severance of relations between the governments of Canada and Great Britain as a result of his action. If anyone is of the opinion that I am exaggerating let him read the words of my right hon. friend for himself.

I was interested to learn the real significance of the word "humbug." My right hon. friend is fond of quoting the Oxford dictionary. I consulted that book to learn what it said about "humbug", not knowing whether or not the word be there. But sure enough it was there, and here is the definition given of it.

Fraud, sham, deception, nonsense.

Deception—the very word that he had used himself, as leader of the opposition and for his party in this parliament, in describing the preference part of the proposal of Mr Dunning—a proposal that did not merit that particular characterization, whereas this proposal more than merited it.

Other dictionaries might be quoted—Murray, for example. The New English dictionary gives the following as one definition:

A thing which is not really what it pretends to be; an imposture, a deception, fraud, sham.

Now, this dictionary even cites as an example of the use of the word in its application to legislation the following from words of Lord Randolph Churchill in 1884:

The whole legislation of the government has been a gigantic humbug.

Surely if Lord Randolph Churchill could describe the whole legislation of the imperial government of that day as "humbug," it ought to be within the bounds of parliamentary etiquette to describe proposals intended to be translated into legislation as "humbug"; and that was the extent of the offences committed with respect to which the right hon. gentleman opposite raised such a furore in Great Britain.

It is interesting—although I do not say this applies in any particular to our own parliament—that the same authority a little further on in citing wherein the words may be applicable to individuals as well as to proposals or offers has the following (1807 in Sheridaniana 211):

"I think, father," said he, "that many men who are called great patriots in the House of Commons, are great humbuds."