

The right hon. Prime Minister on May 23 of the same year, dealing with the same matter, said:

What my hon. friend sought to convey to the house in his remarks was that the government, after having carefully studied the situation from all angles, had come to the conclusion that having regard to the situation of Canada to-day in relation to other countries, it should tell the Canadian people that as respects the tariff, unless there were obvious reasons why there should be changes occasioned by necessity, they might be reasonably assured that there would be a steadiness in the tariff for some little time to come. That is what my hon. friend sought to make clear to this house, and he did so for the reason that what we in Canada can do with justice in the matter of tariff revision is necessarily dependent in large part upon what is done by our neighbours to the south and upon what occurs in Europe.

I find to-day—that France, one of the leading members of the League of Nations, is raising her tariff against Canada, while the Minister of Justice talks vaguely of following the mandates of the league. I find further that the right hon. Prime Minister in those days was saying that what we did was largely dependent on what was being done by our neighbours to the south. They have increased their tariffs against this country year in and year out, so as to shut out practically anything that is Canadian—unless they want our raw materials to fabricate in their own factories. The Prime Minister continued:

What is the position with regard to the United States? Since the Liberal convention was held there has been enacted by the United States a much higher tariff than ever before existed between Canada and the United States. The Fordney-McCumber tariff, so-called, to-day is operating to the disadvantage of Canada.

Here is the question he then propounded, and I put it to my friends yonder:

Is there any member of this house who will stand up in his place and say: Notwithstanding that obvious fact we think we should throw down our bars against the United States and give them an opportunity to come in here and affect our industries in a manner even more seriously than they have already been affected?

An hon. MEMBER: Who said that?

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. Prime Minister of this country on May 23, 1923. But that was intended for consumption by the manufacturers, and when he found he had before him hon. gentlemen led by my friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke), who did not think that way, he commenced to tinker with the tariff, and ever since he has been revising it in the manner that I have indicated. You, sir, will recall that happy expression of the Minister of the Interior who sounded "the death knell of protection" in that famous speech of his, and he now finds himself confronted with the observation I have just

read by his leader. That is the position. It is the old story illustrated by the remarks of the Minister of Railways, who endeavours to make the Canadian people believe that we are the party of high tariff because we have dared to say just what the Prime Minister himself said in 1923, that there is no one in this house or in the country who dare say—what? "Notwithstanding that obvious fact we think we should throw down our bars against the United States." Have you done it? Let the statistical record in regard to imports of iron, steel, agricultural implements, tractors, copper, brass, in fact almost everything that might be mentioned, answer—look at those imports steadily increasing. Just as the minister said, the trend is to increase what we buy from the people of the United States and to sell less and less to them, except raw materials. That is what the right hon. Prime Minister then protested against. But power was more important than adherence to the policy he then laid down, and, as the Minister of Immigration and Colonization said in 1925, his thunderbolts launched against the government secured the abrogation of those expressions of opinion, with the result that we have the tariff as it is to-day. That is the position with respect to it.

One step further, Mr. Speaker. We have been dealing with the problem of immigration, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house have ventured to say that because we on this side have pointed out the actual conditions in this country we were boosting the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: Boosting the United States? Then I ask if that is what the Prime Minister was doing in 1923. May I go further, may I ask my friend from Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) who referred to Sir Richard Cartwright's speeches when the Liberal party was in opposition, was Sir Richard then boosting the United States? That great financial critic pointed out the conditions prevailing in the two countries, and stated what he believed was necessary to be done for the benefit of Canada. It will be a poor day for the Canadian parliament when it becomes a rubber stamp to enforce the will of the Prime Minister; it will be a poor day for this country when the parliament of Canada is to be a rubber stamp to record the will of the Minister of Railways or the Minister of Agriculture; it will be a poor day, sir,—

Mr. DUNNING: Or to rubber stamp your will.

Mr. BENNETT: That might be. What, sir, is the duty of this party? The duty of