

lations, the government has amended the act of parliament providing for proceedings before the tariff board. I do not think the contention of the Minister of Finance that this amounts simply to a change or an amendment of the regulation is well founded. I submit that the government should put in the act an amendment about this ten per cent. All along we have heard that the tariff ought to be made certain; that there should be no uncertainty about it; that if there was a change of government all this possibility of change in the tariff by order in council would disappear, and that he who ran might possibly read the provisions. As the minister of Finance has pointed out, the effect of this is to make the tariff subject to change. In order to carry out the meaning of the law, this ten per cent should be embodied in the act.

Mr. BENNETT: There was one thing the minister did and that was to answer himself. The cuttlefish when pursued is always careful so to obscure the waters that he cannot be followed. We can pass by the hon. gentleman's appeal about the reduction in price, the aid to the consumer and all that sort of thing. Let us look at what was done and find the answer to his whole argument. He said that all they were going to do was to take action by regulation, but we are now considering an amendment to an act of parliament.

Mr. DUNNING: To make the regulation possible.

Mr. BENNETT: Not at all, excuse me. The minister as usual has made an impassioned speech. He called upon high heaven to witness his concern for the poor, suffering consumer and at the same time he pointed out that all they promised to do was to deal with the regulations. That is all the minister did promise; he merely suggested that we should amend the regulations. We are now considering an amendment to an act of parliament. That is not dealing with regulations.

Mr. DUNNING: Oh, yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Not at all. It deals with an order in council and not with regulations. It deals with a statute; it deals with subsection 10 of section 6 of the act. That subsection constitutes my complaint. The Prime Minister promised that he would make the necessary changes, and now his government introduces a statute providing what? There is no reference to ten per cent? No. There

is no reference to that being the quantity? No. But that is what he promised. Now we have a statute introduced, and what does it say? It says:

For the purposes of this act articles shall not be deemed to be of a class or kind made or produced in Canada unless so made or produced in substantial quantities.

And then the minister states, "We will determine what the substantial quantities will be." That is what was said to Japan. He said to Japan, "I promise that we will reduce that to at least ten per cent." But this resolution does not make that declaration, either by regulation, by order or by statute. As I say, the minister has promptly proceeded—

Mr. DUNNING: The promise is being carried out.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister says that the promise is being carried out. What has that to do with the matter? The answer is that the terms are contained in a letter written by the Dominion of Canada to the empire of Japan, and the promise was that the government would make these changes. The fact that they carried this into effect by executive direction until parliament met is one point to be considered, but now parliament has endeavoured to deal with the matter by statute. What was said by the hon. member for Kootenay East is perfectly true, namely, that this applies to the whole act. All that is necessary to do is to make it so that it would no longer be subsection 10; it could be a new section; probably paragraph (a) of some other section would do.

Mr. DUNNING: I think so.

Mr. BENNETT: I should think so; that would be all that would be necessary. Possibly it could be made section 2A or section 3A, and that would cover the situation. But so far as possible I must insist upon placing ourselves on record to the effect that we have endeavoured to meet the conditions which we must impose upon ourselves because of our letter to Japan. In the amendment to the statute we have made no reference to ten per cent. Instead of ten per cent we have mentioned "substantial quantities"; for ten per cent we have substituted a provision enabling the governor in council to provide that that expression may mean something more, and we have covered it up, cuttlefish-like, with the statement that if we find it works out badly we may be able to induce the Japanese to change their minds and help us out.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not say that.