

The Address—Mr. Gardiner

there is none today. We are endeavouring to supply our own wants and other countries are doing the same.

In other words, there is not any possibility of saving this country by trade. Our C.C.F. friends, not to be outdone, had their leader get up at the next session and say, as reported on page 97 of *Hansard* of 1935:

I suggest that it is only as we get away from the idea that we must solve our problems by a larger measure of trade that we shall begin to set our feet on the road that will lead to a permanent solution of our economic problems.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) has well said that the open market is a thing of the past. I do not think he has quite so clearly realized that the world market, the expanding market, is also a thing of the past.

In other words, those people were in agreement in 1935. I may say also that the organizer for the Social Credit party agreed with them in a very few words when he said: "Disregard all this nonsensical talk about trade and tariffs". We at least have them all on the one side of the house. There is not a very large group even when you count all who are sitting over there. The fact that they did all get on the one side of the house at that time may be one reason for our winning elections.

Bringing you down nearer to the present time I am amazed that during this session of parliament our friends have not carried out so far what they were boasting before they came here they were going to do. I had a good speech all ready for them, and I had to change it completely because they did not do what I thought they were going to do.

Mr. Harkness: It is too bad to disappoint you.

Mr. Gardiner: You did not disappoint me at all; you made it better. There is always a reason for everything that anyone does.

An hon. Member: You put your foot in it that time.

Mr. Gardiner: A short time ago we had a by-election in the province of Saskatchewan, and the government of that province thought I was so busy attending these great protest meetings in Ontario, one of which was referred to a few moments ago, that I could not possibly go out there. Therefore they said: We will have an election right away; we will run it on federal issues and we will defeat the provincial Liberal candidate who was running provincially but defeat him on federal issues. You can travel very fast these days and I managed to get out there all right. Just before I got there the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) made a speech, and here is what he said:

"The agricultural policies of Canada affect every-one and the agricultural future presents a dangerous [Mr. Gardiner.]

picture. Mr. Gardiner is responsible for those policies and I say that they are one of the main issues in this election." By virtue of his agreements Mr. Gardiner had assured farmers of future markets for their produce in the United Kingdom. That experiment in security, Mr. Diefenbaker said, had failed completely.

Then he goes on to say:

To support the Liberal candidate will be construed by the federal Liberal party as approval for its agricultural policies.

That was the Conservative party. Let us see now what the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell) had to say at about the same time. He said:

"I am particularly anxious at this time to prevent the election of Liberal candidates, provincially and federally, because of the effect it would have on the Liberal administration at Ottawa. Of particular interest to this constituency," said Mr. Coldwell, "is the manner in which the Hon. James G. Gardiner and the federal government have failed to protect the interests of our agricultural producers. Our farmers have seen their markets disappearing and their incomes slashed."

You could not get words uttered by two men on two different platforms at two different times and without their having met—I do not think they did meet—more nearly similar than what was said on the one hand by the Conservative party and on the other by the C.C.F. Do you know what happened? We have run elections in that constituency for a long time. We won it once by nineteen votes and another time by twenty-nine votes. I think one of our highest majorities was a little over 400 votes. In that constituency they took the words of the hon. member for Lake Centre and they did not vote for the Conservative party. There were only 373 votes polled for the Conservative party in the whole constituency. The Conservatives came within nineteen votes of defeating the Liberals in that constituency on one occasion, and within twenty-nine votes of defeating them on another, and I know where the greater part of the votes went that they did not get this time. When they put the two together and added them all up we still had them trimmed by 132. I can understand why no one raises that issue any more. We have heard very little about it in the house during the present session.

Mr. Ross (Souris): Would it not be fair to refer to Mr. Tucker's statement that night?

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Tucker's statement that night was all right. There are some Conservatives who follow good advice, and we did get some of them. That was the position in 1935 and the position in 1949. All I want to say about it is that from the time Sir John A. Macdonald made his speech at Stanstead, Quebec, in 1877 to the present day Conservative policy has been a policy opposed to trade as a solution for the problems of this