

matter I was dealing. With respect to managed currency I have suggested it would be much wiser, before experimenting ourselves, to wait and see what happens as a result of the experiments now taking place in Great Britain.

In regard to helping those who are in debt, I cannot believe any course that is not fundamentally sound is going to be of lasting benefit to anybody. It is only that thing which is fundamentally sound that, in the long run, will be of any real service to the great body of our people. I think one fundamentally sound step would be to bring high tariffs down to something like a level which would permit trade between this and other countries. That is why the Liberal amendment stresses the present tariff position in Canada. It draws attention to the fact that the tariff is far from what it should be, if trade is to exist on any scale in this country.

I realize our amendment has been criticized on the score that it does not deal with more than one subject. I hope I have already answered that point sufficiently.

Another objection raised, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by some people outside this House of Commons, is that we are debating over and over again, the old question of tariffs. We are asked: Are we going to stick to orthodox economics, as they are called, instead of breaking out into new fields? May I point out, in the first place, that the tariff issue in Canada to-day is altogether different from what it has ever been in this country before. Would any of the former leaders of the Conservative party regard the present tariff as a protective tariff, would they not regard it as a prohibitive tariff? You will find, in their utterances which appear over and over again in Hansard, the statement that they see no necessity for a protective tariff being raised to the point where it becomes a prohibitive tariff. The tariff as we have it to-day is different from any tariff that has existed previously in Canada. It is out of all proportion and beyond the bounds of common sense with respect to the requirements of industry and the needs of this country. It has been made what it is deliberately and for a specific purpose. It was made in its present form to enable the Prime Minister to adopt his blasting tactics, as he has termed them, in order, as he believes is possible, to force other nations to change their attitude towards Canada. It is part of the paraphernalia of economic war in which the present administration believes.

It is the method the present government has deliberately chosen to deal with our

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

economic problems. We have blasting on the one side, and blockading on the other. I would remind hon. members that blockading is one phase, and blasting the other in economic war. We are blockading our ports. The ports of Canada to-day are blockaded against the entry of goods as effectively as has been many a port during a time of war. The trade coming into this country and going out of it as a result of the increased purchasing power which might come from those who sell their goods abroad are alike affected by the blockade. I say the question is entirely different from the one with which Canada has been faced at any previous time.

To revert to the Liberal amendment more in detail; will hon. members opposite deny that the changes in the tariff have been arbitrary? What about the fixing of the values of gasoline; what about oak flooring; what about electric fixtures; what about a multitude of other things we have heard discussed in this chamber? Will anybody say those changes have not been made arbitrarily? Will any hon. member in the Progressive party say those changes were not ill-considered? Will members of the government say they have not been ill-considered? If they were not, why in many cases did the government change them the day after they were put in effect, as they did first of all with respect to the prohibitive duties on glass. We know that innumerable changes were made one day and in some form or other were changed by the government either the next day or a short time afterwards.

What about the regulations in regard to the pound sterling? One course must have been right, and the other wrong, or one would not have been changed for the other. We know the government did not take only one course with regard to the pound sterling; it did one thing one day and another another. One of those changes must have been ill-considered; I leave it to the government to say which one it was. Will hon. members say there have been no inordinate increases in the tariff? Let me mention a very few things. By way of example, there is the duty on silk georgettes, of 85 per cent; on crepe de Chine, of 70 per cent; on cotton backed silk, of 96 per cent; on pongee silk, of 125 per cent; on men's worsteds, 60 per cent; on French serge, 63 per cent, and on men's woollens, from 85 per cent to 140 per cent. I select that list because it affects the clothing of the people in Canada which represents a serious item of expenditure in the cost of all. I might run through other tariff items and show where