

On July 12 it wanted to know, "Why is the King government giving silent consent to the United States boycotting of Canada's farmers? Four days later it said:

The most direct way of grappling with the problem would be to make reasonable endeavours to avert the ill consequences that are staring our farmers in the face. But the King administration has made known to the people of Canada, and to the world at large, that, however it may govern itself accordingly, it will not do anything by way of retaliation. . . . Canada must have a government that will be its champion, and not the servile instrument of the United States.

And as the countervailing duties designed particularly to protect the farmers of Canada are now called "crude and rude," on June 25 last year the Mail and Empire giped at the government because it would not adopt "anything so rude as retaliation." On that occasion its comment was:

What a jumble of confessed cowardice, of hypocritical empire sentiment, of pretended moral feeling against anything so rude as retaliation, of servility to the United States, and of sincere zeal for free trade, is the government's advertised stand in regard to the situation the Washington tariff-makers have created.

In view of these criticisms and more like them, before the Dunning budget was framed, it is impossible to find any sincerity in the present criticism which declares "our neighbors have reasonable ground for complaint for the discrimination it makes against their country."

I know some hon. members, who last year were concerned in a certain movement looking to an increase in their indemnity, who would not have been sorry had the government adopted the principle suggested by the leader of the opposition, that we should sit here until the United States established their new tariff. Certainly that would have brought us a certain amount of extra money last year, which would have been welcome to many of us. Every one knows that congress has been working on the tariff revision for almost two years, and practically nothing has been done as yet. The leader of the opposition seems to think that the application of the countervailing duties would give too much latitude to the government on account of the rapidity with which certain items might be changed in the United States tariff schedule. We do not need to entertain any fear on that score, for the good reason that both houses at Washington have been working overtime for nearly two years, and so far practically nothing has been accomplished.

I have already said that this budget is very popular. In the Toronto Saturday Night of May 10, there is an article by Mr. P. M. Richards, which ends as follows:

Excepting for the fact that the new budget involves many more reductions in the tariff than increases, which in broad principle, is inimical to the best interest of the Canadian industrial fabric, in a general way Mr.

[Mr. Bradette.]

Dunning's budget will no doubt be well received, and is outstanding in its wide departure from many of the more or less conventional budgets of the preceding years.

We have had the spectacle, during the discussion of the budget, of hon. gentlemen opposite calling this a high tariff budget and the opposition in the southeast corner calling it a low tariff budget. We know the people call it just a national, good Liberal budget, and they are satisfied with that. The following comment appeared in the Toronto Globe on Thursday, May 8:

It is unfortunate indeed that the great Conservative party has to be hampered with leadership which condemns another party for attempting to improve its policy while itself adhering to a circumscribed rule-of-thumb idea which is palpably ineffective as well as narrow-visioned. Mr. Bennett, of course, will have to explain on many an occasion what he conceives the British Empire to be "next to Canada," why he does not regard Canada as part of the empire. And he will also have to explain how Canada can shut herself up in a shell and exist, where the farmers of the prairies are going to market their wheat, and what the manufacturers are going to do with their \$4,000,000,000 worth of products.

Why should it be called a high tariff budget, when we have increases on only 100 items while we have decreases on 414 items, giving as a ratio of decreases to increases of over four to one? Really no one who knows anything about figures will try to make this out to be a high tariff budget. It is a low tariff and a national budget.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the financial critic of the group in the southeast corner, the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine). Before I came to this house I was told that the hon. member was a wonderful orator, and I was not disappointed when I heard him speak. He has very complete mastery of the English language and is a born orator, but at the same time I have to ask myself whether the hon. member really believes all the theories which he advances. This evening I was reading an editorial commenting on the speech delivered by the hon. member, which stated that it was too bad that the rules of the house would not allow such a man as the hon. member for Westaskiwin to speak for more than forty minutes upon such important matters. During the course of my hon. friend's remarks he said he could see no leaders who could put into effect his ideas on the government side; he intimated that there was no leader on the Conservative side, so naturally we were to infer that the hon. member for Wetaskiwin was to be the man who would lead the Canadian nation into realms of great happiness and an arcadian period.