

adian. The only opportunity the British government had missed, he said, had been one to tax the food of the people. He described Mr. Bennett's proposal as follows:

The only proposal put before the conference by the Dominions was Mr. Bennett's whose offer was—"I am not going to reduce the tariff against the United Kingdom but I will raise the tariff against the foreigner by 10 per cent of the present rate."

This meant that the duty of 30 per cent would be raised to 33 per cent against the foreigner. . . .

The Canadian Prime Minister had made arrangements for this conference. He had been returned to power a few weeks before its opening and for a fortnight before he left Canada he was engaged in preparing for the conference by making large additions to Canadian duties on British products. Then Mr. Bennett came here and said. "If you will tax foreign wheat I will give you, not reciprocity but I will keep the tariff against this country as it was." That tariff . . . was a prohibitive tariff. Both Mr. Bennett and Mr. Scullin (the Australian Prime Minister) were perfectly honest when they said their policy was to give preference to British imports where they must import these goods, but where British goods competed with Canadian or Australian goods, then they would impose a duty as protection for their own goods. . . .

The dominions, continued Mr. Snowden, are putting up a tariff wall such as to compel us to dismantle our mills here, as was done a few weeks ago in the case of a Yorkshire mill whose machinery was sent to Canada.

Such was the essence of the Canadian proposal, which was the only proposal before the conference, put in definite form. Mr. Snowden suggested the Conservatives in England would now appeal to the country on behalf of imperial unity to enable the dominions to keep out British goods and to increase unemployment in Britain. The Conservative program also said:

We ask you to tax yourselves for the benefit of the dominions and we want the British people to pay the dominions for raising tariffs which will keep out British goods.

Who will not say this is not an accurate analysis of the Prime Minister's proposal? Certainly none of his supporters can consistently repudiate this version. And further, I say that the Prime Minister and his government had no mandate whatever, from the Canadian people to make any such proposition on their behalf. No such proposition ever was discussed before the Canadian electorate and if he would ask for a verdict on any such measure, he would not have a leg to stand on. Both he and his government would be whipped to a finish.

What other decision could you expect from British statesmen to a proposal which, if accepted, would at once hamstring British trade. It is a proposal which does not merit

a moment's favourable consideration at the hands of intelligent Canadians. If the members of this house would only free themselves from all party bias they would at once arise in their might and consign any government which would entertain any such proposition to that political oblivion whence it should never have emerged. And I call upon them one and all to do so now.

On motion of Mr. Rinfret the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

### Wednesday, March 18, 1931

The house met at three o'clock.

#### PRIVILEGE—MR. YOUNG

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. Yesterday when the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) was concluding his speech he assured the house that at this session the fullest opportunity would be given thoroughly to discuss and consider all the legislation brought down, but he added that the house would not listen or the government did not propose to listen to such vaudeville effusions as emanated from the member for Weyburn during the short session.

I know my right hon. friend has been working very hard. I know he is tired and his nerves are on edge, and I am prepared to make every possible allowance—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) would be better advised to make his remarks when we come to the orders of the day rather than at the present time, if he should be in order then.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I submit that a question of privilege is in order at any time. As a matter of fact, the rules of the house indicate that the sooner such a question is raised the better. I humbly submit—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member for Weyburn is raising a question of privilege he is in order. I did not understand him to be so doing.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes, your honour, it is a question of personal privilege.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): He certainly was not discussing a question of privilege when called to order.