

every man in this house is to think in terms of his country, and when he finds in 1923 the Prime Minister declaiming against a possible attitude of mind towards the great republic to the south in dealing with fiscal matters, and then changing his mind and calling upon his friend from Brandon and that gentleman's associates to support reductions in the tariff from year to year,—I say the duty of every hon. member is clear. We who criticize know that the right hon. gentleman does not change his mind so lightly, we know there is a purpose behind the change, and we have a right to seek the purpose. And if we have a right to point out the effect we have also a right to point out the purpose. The purpose is power; the effect is injury to Canada. It means loss of population to this country. And it means more than that. The American commercial reports indicating the movement of farm machinery to this country mean that just so many Canadians as might have been engaged in the manufacture of that machinery here are without jobs. Is it treason to point that out? Did the right hon. gentleman hesitate to do it when he talked of usurpation of power and abuse of the institutions of this country? When he spoke of those matters in days gone by was it treason on his part? Do hon. gentlemen opposite fancy that they can becloud the minds of the Canadian people by making such observations? Let me assure them that so long as we are here, so long as we occupy the seats to which we have been elected, we propose fearlessly to criticize the acts of the government notwithstanding what they may say. It ill becomes ministers of the crown, responsible ministers, to foster such a delusion as that and to charge us with engaging in immigration propaganda in the interests of the United States. My hon. friends opposite know perfectly well that people are shut out of that country under the laws that prevail there. Aware of these things, we propose to criticize the government so long as no effort is made to provide work for our people; because work is what is very urgently needed in Canada. Every effort, therefore, which this party makes is an effort to secure work for Canadians and not for others.

I would remind my hon. friends of one other fact. When they were in opposition what did they do? They were not content to make speeches on subjects such as my hon. friend from Hants-Kings has discussed; they moved resolutions. And what was the purport of the resolutions they moved in 1889, in 1890 and again in 1891? It was to secure unrestricted freedom in the trade relations between the United States and Canada. The

[Mr. Bennett.]

reform which was suggested, to quote the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was the absolute reciprocal freedom of trade between the two countries. This briefly sums up the history of my hon. friends in this regard; this is the record of those who now attack us because we venture to assert the rights of Canada and to urge those rights as being of greater moment to us than the interests of the United States. When we turn to the record of the party opposite when in opposition, we find that, making a strong appeal for support in 1891, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

The reform suggested by the Liberal party is absolute reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States.

How long would there have been a Dominion of Canada had that policy been carried into effect? Is that my hon. friends' policy to-day? Is that the goal towards which they are striving? Is that the reason for the tariff being reduced? Is that the reason that they are pursuing the course proposed in days gone by? Let my hon. friends answer these questions before they attack those who sit to the left of the Speaker.

I will not venture to trespass further on the time of the house, but I merely point out that, according to the Commercial Intelligence Journal which we received last week, I find at page 354 that whereas the imports of automobile parts for assembly amounted in 1927 to \$29,582,000, in 1926 they were only \$25,000,000, an increase of over \$4,000,000; while automobile parts for replacement are given respectively as \$4,919,000 and \$3,600,000. The same condition of things exists in regard to rods. That is the effect of the government's legislation: with decreasing exports we are assembling parts to a greater extent than before. This means less work for Canadians—less manufacturing and an increasing tendency towards the assembling of parts. Now, what is the aim of the Conservative party? It is to endeavour to make this country economically independent. Our objective is to render the Dominion of Canada no longer dependent upon foreigners for our economic existence. I put this to the government: If we are obliged always to go abroad for all our machinery, what will happen supposing, in a moment of caprice, that foreign supply is shut off? What did Adam Smith say on this point?

Mr. DUNNING: Surely you will not quote him.

Mr. BENNETT: I admit that one should be reluctant to quote Adam Smith after the Prime Minister, but I do not think it is at