

the low tariff party. To-day I no longer wonder; I am quite convinced from these figures that as between the two old parties the low tariff party sits to our right while the high tariff party occupies the benches opposite, including in their ranks the hon. members from Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

In his zeal and in his enthusiasm to represent the people who elected him, the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) placed a resolution on the order paper at the beginning of this session asking that section 43 of the Customs Act be eliminated. That resolution was called twice, but the hon. member failed to respond. I am not blaming him particularly; when he filed that resolution I believe he did so honestly, and with the firm conviction that he was representing the viewpoint of the people who sent him here and in order to carry out his pre-election promises. But I wonder what happened after he reached Ottawa? It would be interesting to know what happened in those Liberal councils to which the Prime Minister asked us to send representatives.

Then again, we have the hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly). In his zeal to represent the people who sent him here he brought down a resolution asking that mixing at the terminal elevators be eliminated in connection with grades 1, 2 and 3 of wheat. I know that is a burning question in his constituency, but the hon. member was a little more frank than my friend from Weyburn. He did not wait for the Speaker to call the resolution; he withdrew it from the order paper, and I wonder just what happened in the party councils to bring about this result.

Mr. DONNELLY: Would my hon. friend like to know? I was advised by the Saskatchewan pool not to proceed.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That is no answer at all. If my hon. friend's constituents wanted that action taken he should have had the house divide on the question. The hon. member for Brandon, the present Minister of Immigration, speaking in Winnipeg on September 17, 1925, is reported by the Manitoba Free Press to have said:

The absorption of the Progressives by the Liberal party, whether in or out of office and under whatever guise effected, would postpone for a generation the attainment of necessary reforms.

I am not going to criticize the minister, because I believe he said that from the depths of his heart; I believe that was his honest conviction, and if he would admit it I think it is still his firm opinion. However, we have all seen what has happened; a part of our rep-

resentation from Saskatchewan and Manitoba has been absorbed, and you see the effect in this budget. When appealing to the Progressives to give up their organization and join with the Liberals, the Prime Minister is quoted as saying at Moose Jaw, during the campaign of 1925, the following:

Mr. Crerar and Mr. Hoey did not present themselves in this election. Mr. Forke is like the ordinary Scotchman; he is going to hang on to anything he has until the end.

I am sorry the Prime Minister was not such a good prophet as the Minister of Immigration, because the minister did not hang on very long.

I listened with interest and attention to the speech of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Beaubien) a few evenings ago. We miss his smiling face, his ready wit and genial companionship on this side of the house. For a long time I looked forward to the day when he, like the prodigal son, would return to us, but his speech indicated that there is no hope of that now. He at least is one of those who have been absorbed, and for whom there is no hope. The hon. member objected to the reduction in the income tax, and I think he pleaded with the minister not to increase the duty on lace, or something like that. Knowing what a ladies' man the hon. member is I can understand his concern, but he wound up by saying that he was going to vote with the government anyway. In effect and in substance he said to the government, "I do not like your budget, but I am going to vote for it anyway." What is the effect of that? I say my hon. friends from Manitoba must bear the full responsibility for the fact that such a budget is now before the house.

Let us go back over our history from 1922. The first really good budget, from our standpoint was in 1924, and that was due to the fact that the government lost some by-elections and were in a weakened position. At that time the pressure from this corner of the house forced them to live up to their own policy and carry out, in a measure at least, their own pledges. Then almost the same thing happened in 1926, and here is the irony of the situation; on the strength of those two budgets this government is in power to-day. As a matter of fact we saved the government in spite of itself; and I wonder who is going to save the government the next time? I understand and appreciate the difficulties which my hon. friends from Manitoba have had to face, but I put it up to them squarely where their duty lies to-day. Should they not take an independent position and stand over here, serving notice on the government that unless