

policy. We now have the proposal of a public works program to be instituted by this government, over which they will have complete control; but so far, with the single exception that the Department of National Defence is giving employment to a number of unmarried unemployed, this government has done nothing but issue relief through the medium of the provincial governments. If it is not doles, what is it? This country is on the dole to an extent never known before, put on the dole by the leader of this government in direct defiance of the pledge given to the electorate of Canada upon which he was elected and now sits in this house. But that was not the only pledge he gave; he gave many more. A great deal was made of unemployment at that time and the right hon. gentleman promised work and not doles. There has been no work however but rather doles, in direct contradiction of the promise he made on that occasion. He said that every man who was willing to work would have work; and on one occasion he said, "Let us not be deceived; let us get to grips with this problem; let us have action, not words." That must be very satisfying to the men on relief to-day. He said:

I am a man, just as you men who are here, one of your fellow citizens. I have responsibilities, as every man in my position has, and I must not lightly make statements that I am not prepared to the last syllable to carry into effect. And I will not.

I leave it to the judgment of hon. members, to what extent these very solemn promises made by the Prime Minister of this country are being carried into effect to-day.

Mr. POULIOT: None.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I know the problem is a difficult one. We knew it was a difficult one in 1930; we were fully aware of that fact, but we did not then and do not now propose to make to the electorate promises that we will utterly fail to implement or even not try to implement; yet this government has done so. I do not intend to say more about unemployment; I am going to delay further remarks upon this question until the bill is introduced to provide work; I hope the bill will provide work and that some attempt will be made, by the government to keep some of its promises on which they were elected. A country like Canada, with all the latent natural resources possessed by it, has no licence to be in the unfortunate position she is in to-day with respect to unemployment, and I lay responsibility for that at the door of the present government.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

The leader of the party to my left (Mr. Gardiner) the other day took exception to the statement of my leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) that the gentleman recently appointed to the tariff board was a Conservative; that he was not a Progressive. I may say to my hon. friend that I never heard a better Tory speech delivered in this house than the one delivered by that same gentleman who then represented Mackenzie. He sought during forty minutes to prove that the Liberal party by their policies had a higher average tariff than that imposed by the Conservatives. If my hon. friend was under any illusion about where that gentleman stood, subsequent events must have dissipated it to some extent when he was appointed to the tariff board because I have not noticed this government being very generous to opponents who opposed them vigorously. This appointment will be one in a list of hundreds, and on every occasion the government took good care to see to it, as they had a right to do, that those appointees were men of opinion similar to their own.

Mr. POULIOT: The former member for Mackenzie was a whitewashed sepulchre.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I give my hon. friend some of my reasons for making those statements, because I think it is important on questions of tariff that we reiterate from time to time the exact position of the application of tariffs by the two historic parties. I am going to give figures in connection with well known imports, imports that are used every day. I have under my hand a table of comparative tariff rates under five different tariff programs. The rates are as applied to imports from Great Britain—rates against other countries under the Bennett or the Bennett-preference tariffs are unbelievably high. I take first cotton printed piece goods, a commodity that goes into every home. The rates are as follows:

Government—	Rate Per cent
Conservative—Borden . . . . .	25
Conservative—Meighen . . . . .	25
Liberal—King . . . . .	18
Conservative—Bennett . . . . .	61
Conservative— British preference . . . . .	58.5

Then there is white cotton flannelette, another commodity used more or less in every home in Canada:

Government—	Rate Per cent
Conservative—Borden . . . . .	17½
Conservative—Meighen . . . . .	17½
Liberal—King . . . . .	15
Conservative—Bennett . . . . .	55
Conservative— British preference . . . . .	52