

the British government described the Bennett proposal as the "very bankruptcy of statesmanship and as demonstrably and intently foolish and useless".

To my mind there is only one explanation of such a strange proceeding. I entirely absolve the hon. gentleman of any intentional wrong doing. But the fact remains that after having sniffed the salt air at some point in the Atlantic he must have become so mentally aberrated that when he reached Great Britain he at once began roving around seeking whom he might attack. He first stirred up the British cabinet by his peremptory demand for the taxation of British foodstuffs. Then followed his charge that the Northampton boot and shoe makers were employing cheap labour and dumping their goods into the Canadian market, and when the British boot and shoe makers denied and resented his assertion and sought an interview on the matter, according to press reports, he refused them.

He next fell foul of the Lancashire cotton manufacturers, accusing them in the same way. These are but instances of his blasting process heralded all over Canada during the election campaign.

I followed in my younger days a sea-faring life more or less for over twenty years and I know that there are cases of serious mental affection on the sea. On one occasion I met a neighbour as he landed on the docks in Glasgow and his captain insisted that he be handed to the health authorities for careful mental supervision. I pleaded to be allowed to convey him to his friends in Edinburgh, which was done. There he was placed under the most careful medical supervision for over six weeks, but with no improvement; then he was allowed to return home. On his return he told me that when he reached a certain zone in the Atlantic, where he had become mentally indisposed, his usually good sane condition returned at once. If this is really what happened to the right hon. gentleman he has my sincere sympathy, but we see no indication of a sensible condition or he would hasten to make sufficient amends to the British government at least.

If our honoured leader were to talk and make such a mess of his business while representing Canada in the old land, we would challenge him at once. However, it is only right to know, and we have the right to ask, what hon. gentlemen opposite think and intend doing regarding the action of a leader in so trampling on the good name of Canada and so abusing the trust which has been placed in his keeping?

The people of Canada are demanding to know what is and what will be the attitude of

[Mr. T. McMillan.]

the right hon. gentleman's own supporters in this matter of burning significance to the good name of Canada. Scores of good citizens have said to me that this government would never last its term out, but my reply has been "Yes, it will; it will last its term out, unless its own supporters in this house rise in protest and rebellion against this kind of thing." When I would relate how this government's own followers sat dumb as oysters and swallowed the whole proceedings and high-handed legislation of the recent short session, they marvelled at their simplicity, and when I instanced how the power and authority of their leader over his followers was so absolute, that when, for instance, the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) rose on one occasion to address the house, the Prime Minister without ever rising from his seat, simply turned his head and commanded him to sit down, saying that that matter could be discussed at some other time, they were amazed that any member would cringe in submissiveness and remain silent under such a rebuke.

But what else can you expect under the direction of a small coterie of millionaire manipulators, who have amply demonstrated that they care not a straw for the hard-worn farmers and wealth producers of this country? I feel there must be many hon. gentlemen in this house sitting behind this government who in their hearts do not approve of this government's record, and the sooner they rise in the majesty of their manhood, break through such party chains and assert what they believe to be for the best interests of this country, the better it will be for themselves and this country as a whole.

Compare the record of the present Prime Minister at the Imperial conference with that of his predecessors in office. The leader of this government, by his declarations at the Imperial economic conference, has identified himself with the protectionist element of the Conservative party in Great Britain and has become embroiled in the party strife of the old land. This is in marked contrast with the restraint shown by the representatives of Canada at previous Imperial conferences. Consider the wise words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier on a similar occasion:

We Canadians would not accept the idea that the British public should force upon us their own fiscal views, and no more would they tolerate the idea that we would force upon them our own fiscal views; therefore the only way in which the British Empire can be maintained upon its present foundation is by allowing every nation composing it the measure of liberty that it has, and also the free choice of the fiscal policy it is to maintain.