

Let me again assure my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) I had this written out merely for the purpose of accuracy owing to the importance of the subject and my desire to get before the house as clear a statement as I could give it on this very important matter. But I pause now to emphasize this, and I ask my hon. friends, particularly those from western Canada, to accord to a government at least some measure of cooperation and support when we make an effort of this kind, obviously taking some risks in judgment, for the purpose of holding steady the great wheat market of Canada which is one of the most important things affecting our economic life.

My hon. friend opposed the budget proposals. He opposed the reduction of the pound for duty purposes from \$4.40 to \$4.25. He opposed the exchange stabilization scheme. He opposed reductions in tariff on some thirty items.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. STEVENS: He opposed increase in the excise on perfumeries, the increase in the income tax. He opposed the adjustment of the sales tax. He opposed the revenue tax on sugar and he opposed and denounced the tax on bonds held outside Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Where does the hon. member find justification for saying that the hon. gentleman opposed reductions in tariff?

Mr. STEVENS: I find it in the amendment to the budget, where he says:

They imply a continuance of fiscal and other policies which have not only signally failed to afford any solution of our national problems, but have been proven to have the effect of diminishing trade. . . .

The increases in taxation proposed in the budget resolutions will fall most heavily on those least able to bear the burden thereof.

Then he winds up his amendment by saying:

For these and other reasons, this house is of opinion that the present government no longer possesses the confidence of the country.

The right hon. gentleman rises in his place and asks: Where do you find any justification for saying that we oppose these? The right hon. gentleman does not like to see these items brought out individually.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said justification for the statement that he was opposing reductions in tariff.

Mr. STEVENS: So he did.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, he did not.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth, in this resolution, cheered and supported by the ex-Prime Minister and all his followers, condemned everything that was in the budget. The right hon. gentleman will not find in that speech of March 24, 1933, a single word approving of anything the government has done or proposes to do.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEVENS: Hon. gentlemen opposite agree. They say: "Hear, hear." The situation, however, is this, that in the proposals in the budget there are some points which we certainly realize will be distasteful to some of the taxpayers. That is debatable ground; it is ground on which one might expect divergent opinion. But there are in the budget some things which my hon. friends opposite dare not oppose and then face their constituents. They will express a wholesale condemnation of the government instead of indicating that so far as the effort of the government is concerned, in certain respects they give it their endorsement.

The reduction of the pound for duty purposes from \$4.40 to \$4.25, is it good or is it not? Is it in the interest of Canada and her relations with the British Empire or not? Which is it? My hon. friends dare not oppose that individually, but they condemn the government and all its works as a whole and would vote it out of office. Is the exchange stabilization capable of support? Will my hon. friends from western Canada whom I see over there, my hon. friends from the rural districts of Ontario, from the rural districts of Quebec, support this or will they not?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. STEVENS: They will not. That is their own lookout. As far as we are concerned, we believe it is in the interest of the primary producers. Will they support the increase in the income tax? They will not discuss it, but they will condemn the government that undertakes it. They will twit the government on being the friend of the big interests, although we are increasing the corporation tax from 11 to 12½ per cent. In their resolution they condemn us for doing this. The other day the hon. member condemned us in so many words for imposing the five per cent tax on earnings from bonds held outside Canada. He stood in his place, with the right hon. gentleman behind him, and said to the Minister of Finance that he warned him that this was not a very promising source of revenue and something that might result in