

The Budget—Mr. Studer

line, to the detriment of some other particular line. For instance, it had regard to agriculture, industry, and every line in the general economy of Canada that one might care to mention. This particular balance is the secret of good government. In my estimation it is the reason why opposition members are here in smaller numbers than they were last year. It keeps them in a position where one could say they are "fanning the air," because they have most certainly changed their amendment and subamendment from what it was last spring. Here is the amendment that the opposition offered last spring. For the benefit of those of us who are newly arrived here, the amendment offered by the opposition, to be found at page 2188 of *Hansard* of March 31, 1949, reads as follows:

This house is of the opinion that the government does not possess the confidence of the country.

A subamendment was moved by one of these splinter parties which reads as follows, as reported on page 2192 of *Hansard*:

regrets (a) the failure of the government to remove the sales tax; (b) the action of the government in removing the subsidy on flour milled for domestic purposes, thus adding to the cost of living, and (c) the failure of the government, despite rising national income, to make any provision to improve the living standards of the millions of Canadian people compelled to live on income below the income tax exemption levels.

The amendment of this year is considerably different. It will be found on page 1023 of *Hansard* and reads as follows:

This house regrets that the government has failed to take effective measures to prevent the present decline in our trade with the sterling area and is of the opinion that the government should consider the advisability of inviting the nations of the commonwealth to a conference in the immediate future for the purpose of working out arrangements to preserve and enlarge those traditional markets on which jobs and opportunities for Canadians very largely depend.

One of the splinter groups again moved a subamendment, which is to be found at page 1027, and reads as follows:

Give immediate consideration to a reduction of tariffs sufficient to encourage an increase in imports from the United Kingdom and other sterling countries.

These opposition groups have changed their position. Last spring one of them said that the country did not have any confidence in the government. They have changed their position to one that is a shadow of what it might have been had we not had as good a government as we have had during these past years. Much of what is contained in the amendment and in the subamendment has been in existence in the operations of the government. I do not think that any government in power in Canada could make any particular move in regard to the operation and ramification of business in the world

[Mr. Studer.]

today without having a conference with members of other governments in other parts of the world. I do not believe that this government would ever leave anything undone in regard to free trade that would be to the benefit of this country. If it is possible to import something that this country needs, and if it will not injure someone in this country, I am sure that it will be done. As I see it, it should be kept in mind that if we are to import into Canada goods that are produced by people in other countries who have not the same standards of living that we have it will most certainly lead to unemployment in this country. If our workers receive \$1.25 or \$1.50 an hour and the workmen in some other country are receiving much less to produce a particular article, to import that article would certainly mean that we would be lowering our standard of living and creating unemployment in this country. Therefore, again I come back to the balance that this government has always had in view in the entire economy of this country.

We do not wish to reduce the standard of living of any of our labouring people. We wish to raise it. We wish also to raise the standard of living of people in other countries so that when we trade with one another we do not do it to the detriment of our people. That is the Maple Creek view of what this situation can lead to in this country of ours. The balance which the government has used in its operations is proved by the overwhelming majority which is evident in this parliament at this session. I hope that the government will continue its operations in the same manner. Some reference was made the other night to the happy expression on the face of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott). I would suggest that that happy expression was due to the fact that he did not take the advice of the opposition in the past years.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that in the budget debate, as on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, hon. members can talk about all situations and bring them before the parliament of Canada. During this session we have heard many speakers talking about their constituencies and about what is produced in various areas. Some hon. members have referred to iron ore, lumber, oil, coal and uranium. Some other hon. members spoke of apples, peaches, grapes, wheat and other grains, livestock and beef, and all the good things of this world. Every constituency has its differences. They are all affected by duties and tariffs. We are affected by them in Saskatchewan. We are interested in tariffs and duties. I am interested particularly because there is a hundred and