

the most part cheerful; they were chatty; they were spicy. At the close they were emphatic and a little dramatic. So far however as giving us any real conception of what the Conservative party stands for at this time; so far as presenting any idea of what my hon. friend has in mind with respect to the nature of the appeal he proposes to make to the people when the opportunity comes, I am afraid we will search his address from beginning to end without the least in the way of enlightenment. Indeed, as one listened to my hon. friend it was apparent that he had gone through the speech from the throne with the aid of a microscope. His remarks in reference to it were in large part related to words which he thought had been wrongly left out in one place and to others that had been wrongly inserted in another place; to a phrase that might have some special significance because it happened to be just where it was, or to something which he alleged had been put in by design or which had been left out by design, and so on from the beginning to the close. It was certainly illustrative of industry from the point of view of microscopic observation, but as for discovering anything more I am afraid we shall have to search the records in vain.

I did not expect that my hon. friend would find the speech from the throne to his liking. He said that the mover and the seconder of the address had some difficulty with respect to their remarks. If there is anyone who has had difficulty with respect to his remarks, it is my hon. friend himself; because his difficulty has been to discover, in a time of great prosperity, wherein he could make any effective criticism of the record of the present administration. In the course of his remarks he has been very careful to confine his criticism, not to the record of the government during the period we have been in office, not to the record of the government since the last general election, not to the record of the government during the past year, but to a few temporary circumstances prevailing at the moment, or exhibiting themselves in one form or another in particular localities. His remarks had no reference to the past year as a whole; they were confined to this and that community in which there happened to be perhaps a little more than elsewhere in the way of unemployment, to the last month or two when trade statistics were not quite as favourable as in the previous months. But the very fact that my hon. friend carefully avoided attempting to review the situation as a whole is evidence of the fact that having made that survey carefully himself, he de-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

cidated it was best to confine his remarks to what largely because of seasonal conditions had happened more or less within the past few weeks.

My hon. friend concluded his address with some reference to the present administration not being entitled to have its members attend an imperial conference without first of all appealing to the people and receiving a mandate for that purpose. I do not know whether or not it is my hon. friend's wish that the people should be given that opportunity, but I may tell him it is quite possible they will have it. My hon. friend says to us: "We on this side of the house are not asking for legislation against anyone; we are asking only for legislation so far as Canada is concerned."

Mr. BENNETT: For Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, for Canada. What was his attitude and that of all hon. gentlemen opposite at the last session when they said they were prepared to sit in their places from June of last year until, if need be, the year following, for what purpose? Was it not to legislate against someone?

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The whole attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite was this: We are ready to wait and see what the United States do, and the moment we know what they are going to do, we will slap back at them; we will enact reprisals that will teach them a lesson they will never forget. But now my hon. friend says that he has not any desire to legislate against any person. He quotes Professor Taussig, and he says Professor Taussig has said that the United States has treated Canada for a number of years "much like a big bully treats a small boy." May I say to my hon. friend that is no reason why this country should play either the part of a small boy or a bully? May I direct my hon. friend's attention to what Professor Taussig had in mind in that particular remark? The whole purpose of the article in which that remark appears and which I have in my hand—I thought my hon. friend would probably quote from it here—was to point out the unwisdom in international affairs of attempting anything in the nature of reprisals with a desire to effect any good. My hon. friend says that I ought to know something of Professor Taussig. I do know something of him.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say the hon. gentleman ought to know; I said he did.