

ada, and I do deplore the fact that the hon. gentleman who preceded me attempted to raise any sectional feeling among the various classes of opinion in the country in which we live.

I shall endeavour to deal just for a few moments with some of the problems that have been raised. I was very much interested, as a new member naturally would be, in hearing the discussion during this debate as well as in the debate which took place in the short session, and in hearing members from various sections of Canada explain the difficulties that afflict their particular localities and the problems in which they are especially interested. I was particularly interested in the debate which took place between the right hon. the Prime Minister and the right hon. the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition made a very long speech. I am sure many of us envy him his remarkable fluency of expression, his ability to take a shopworn or commonplace expression and surround it with such a multiplicity of words as to make it look fairly passable. I should like to contrast with that the clear and incisive reasoning of the Prime Minister, who in one third the time answered completely every argument that was presented by the leader of the opposition. I noticed one statement made by the leader of the opposition near the beginning of his address regarding the spirit of harmony. He said that during the time he was Prime Minister:

There was a steady decrease of taxation, and all was accompanied by a spirit of harmony, unity and good-will between the governments of the provinces and the government of the Dominion, a spirit such as had not prevailed for many years previously.

It seemed very strange to me that he should make a statement of that kind. I remember that in the months just preceding the election there was not that particular spirit of harmony and good will between the government which he headed and the governments of some of the provinces which happened to be under Conservative administration, and which could not expect even a plugged nickle from the Prime Minister of that day for the relief of unemployment. I cannot see how that spirit of harmony and good will was promoted to the extent which he claims. In addition to that, the leader of the opposition at the beginning of his speech gave long strings of statistics, long columns, to prove that Canada was in a prosperous condition when he handed over the reins of office. It reminds me of an incident that occurred in the town of Cornwall. The leader of the opposi-

tion spoke there on the Friday immediately preceding the election and I heard his speech over the radio. He gave the statistics which he quoted in different places throughout Canada, attempting to prove by a set of figures that the people of this country were prosperous. I met a working man on the street the next day and asked him how he liked Mr. King's speech. Let me say by the way that he was not a Conservative. He replied, "I was disappointed. Mr. King came to the town of Cornwall. I have been out of work for six months and I expected that he would have something to offer, but instead of bread he handed us a stone." And the people of Cornwall showed their appreciation of the arguments used by the then Prime Minister on that occasion by the vote which they polled on the following Monday.

There is one thing which the leader of the opposition omitted from his speech and which I expected him to mention. I remember he dealt at considerable length in his address at Cornwall, on that Friday preceding the election, with the great danger that confronted Canada then if a Conservative government were returned to power in the Dominion, with Conservative administrations extending over Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We were going to be robbed of that great heritage which had been handed down to us by our ancestors, that heritage of freedom for which they had sacrificed themselves and given their lives. An oligarchy would be formed, consisting of the Conservative Prime Minister of the Dominion and the Conservative premiers of the provinces, which would in some mysterious way rob us of our freedom. But the unexpected to the Prime Minister of that day has happened, and I do not think that at this time any of us are suffering from any of the ills which he predicted. On the other hand, the right hon. gentleman has given up the role of champion of the freedom of the people of Canada which he assumed prior to the election and has now come forward in the present debate in the role of champion of the freedom of the people of Great Britain from the oppression of the present Prime Minister of Canada.

The leader of the opposition condemned bargaining; he called it economic coercion. He said he would rather adopt the method which he had followed during his administration, the method of conciliatory approach. How can you do business on such a basis? Can private individuals do business by the method of conciliatory approach, leaving bargaining out of the question? To my mind business between nations is on exactly the