

operation with the Conservatives any way it may be taken, but not when the first part is taken without the second part or the second part without the first.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite prepared to have my hon. friend stand by the whole sentence; that is all.

Mr. KENNEDY: Why did not the Prime Minister quote it all?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I quoted what was essential.

Mr. KENNEDY: No, the Prime Minister quoted the part which misrepresented me; that is my claim. Just while we are on this question we may as well settle it; I said I would stand by that statement.

Is it possible for this group to cooperate with the Conservatives? Last year I placed on Hansard figures which showed that there was a difference of only about one per cent in the tariff policies of the two parties, on an average, and that difference is just about the same to-day. I do not know whether or not the Prime Minister wishes to dispute that statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Really I do not know what my hon. friend is after.

Mr. BENNETT: I would say he is after the Prime Minister.

Mr. KENNEDY: Very well; here is the statement I made last year, which will be found at page 201 of Hansard:

During the last election I was informed that some of my Liberal friends were very much peeved at me because I said that there was scarcely any difference between the Liberal and the Conservative tariff policies. I want to repeat that to-day, and so that there may be no misunderstanding, I should like to put on Hansard a statement covering all the years the Conservatives were in power from 1888 to 1897 and from 1913 to 1922. I have given the Conservatives credit in each case for one year after they went out. In the statement I have given the figures regarding the Liberals from 1898 to 1912 and from 1922 to 1926. In both cases I show the average tariff collections against all dutiable imports and against all imports dutiable and free, and taking the whole period during which both parties were in power respectively I find that there is a difference of just .8 per cent in favour of the Liberals. If you take all the years the Conservatives were in power you will find that the collections on dutiable imports averaged 27.4 per cent while in the case of the Liberals, during the whole time they were in power, the collections averaged 26.6 per cent, or a difference of .8 per cent. Taking the figures covering all imports we find, in the case of the Conservatives, an average of 17.2 per cent and in the case of the Liberals, 16.4 per cent.

78594—80½

Then followed the complete statement. I do not think I will read it, but I have worked out the averages on this basis, which I will give the house. During the years the Conservatives were in power their average as against all dutiable imports was 27.4 per cent, while the average of the Liberals was 26.5 per cent; the Conservative average against all imports was 17.2 per cent and the Liberal average 16.4 per cent, or a difference of about one per cent in the applied policy. This is not the so-called "known" but the "applied" policy. At that time I invited criticism of that statement, because I wanted to hear what the other side said about it, but so far as I could see the only answer was this statement handed in by the Prime Minister in which he gave a table showing the reductions in the customs duties on instruments of production in the basic industries of agriculture, mining, lumbering and fishing. Anyone who will look at the pages of Hansard containing that statement will be struck with the relatively large reductions which were made in 1924 and 1926, but were those strictly Liberal budgets or were they the result of Liberal administration? In 1923, in a by-election at Kent, New Brunswick, the Liberals lost one seat to the Conservatives and faced the House of Commons in 1924 with one less than a majority. During that year large reductions were made in the duties on agricultural implements. Then in 1926 we had about one hundred Liberals of a total membership of the house of 245, that was another year when large reductions were made, and I do not think either of these budgets in reality could be called Liberal budgets.

Then let us consider the statement made by the Prime Minister at Edmonton on October 11, 1924 as follows:

When criticizing the present Liberal government Mr. King asked his audience to bear in mind the difficulties that had to be faced, and he pointed out that if a Liberal government had been in power it would have been an easy matter for his administration to have lived up to the promises that were made when he appealed to the country in the last general election.

The argument advanced was that there was not a sufficient majority to carry out these policies, but the point is that the years during which real advances were made in accordance with that policy as laid down by the Liberal convention of 1919 were the years when the Liberal party were in a minority in this house. What has happened since the government came back with a majority, with the help of our Liberal-Progressive friends, who must accept some responsibility? There has been a distinct move away from direct taxation through the