

sell their grain there. Not only did we agree that the available markets were becoming fewer, but we were also in agreement that the British market was the best that Canada could possibly have, that Britain was our best customer, and that to secure, in the British market, something that would maintain our position and expand and develop it was after all the great objective at which we should aim. We were further agreed as to this: that the problem of unemployment would be solved in the last analysis only by solving the question of Canada's export trade. I think I am right in that, though there was not the same emphasis laid on that phase by hon. gentlemen opposite. We on this side stressed that point; hon. gentlemen opposite maintained that unemployment was mainly due to the policies of the then administration. They did not say, as we said and still contend, that the reason there was unemployment in Canada, and the reason there is to-day, is that agriculture in this country is not getting an opportunity to export its commodities to the extent to which it should, that the grain growers have not the markets they should have. As a consequence there is not the purchasing power in western Canada to afford a home market for many of our manufactures, because the home market is not a locality; it is purchasing power. It is a fund of purchasing power. A large part of that fund, in the first instance, has to come from the sale of wheat and agricultural products. We were in agreement on one further point, and that was that the Imperial economic conference which was to be held in October had an important bearing on the situation. That conference was called to discuss economic conditions and questions of inter-empire trade, and that was the reason, among other things, why the appeal was made to the country when it was—so that the people might have an opportunity before the conference took place of pronouncing on the respective policies of the parties. When we were in office we realized that if we obtained the endorsement of the people of Canada to the policies as set out in the Dunning budget, we could go to the Imperial conference armed with the support of the people and that in all probability we would get out of that conference something which would mean a good deal to western agriculture and indeed to all agriculture in this country. I do not intend to go over the ground as to why we did not succeed in that appeal, but the fact remains that we put our policies before the people and we gave as our reason for them a desire to get more largely into the British market.

That being the agreement all along the line, where does the difference arise? The difference arises not over any question as to what the situation is, but over the method of approach and policy. If hon. members will be so kind, I am going to ask them to pay a good deal of attention to what I say this afternoon with respect to the difference of methods of approach on these important subjects, because there is a fundamental difference in the attitude adopted by the two parties. There is a real difference between my right hon. friend and myself in this matter of approach, and I do not think he will deny it—he will perhaps correct me if in this I am in error. In approaching these questions he has a certain belief in what he calls bargaining and in action which is in the nature of coercion. Personally, I do not believe that that method of approach, the method of coercion, gets anywhere in the long run. It may win for a day, it may win for a week or for a year, but it brings very strange results and reversals after a time. I believe that the method of conciliatory approach is much better than an approach by means of coercion. I believe that the method of creating an atmosphere of good will and discovering if possible common ground will do more in bringing about agreement than will talk of might, power and force, whether it is economic force or any other kind of force that is to be used. There is the difference between my right hon. friend, and those who sit around him, and myself and those who sit on this side of the house. We differ as to the method of approach, and in fact, as a result, there is a difference also in our policies. The policies of hon. gentlemen opposite are based on this method of approach, and our policies are based on the methods we believe in and have always followed.

Having in mind the Imperial conference and knowing the questions which were to come up, we shaped our course accordingly. We sought to prepare the way for creating a favourable atmosphere in Britain towards what we might seek at the Imperial conference. We sought by the legislation which we passed in this parliament to create through the voluntary giving of preferences a situation which would in the natural order of things place Great Britain and other governments of the empire under certain obligations to this country. If we did not succeed with that method there was still time for parliament to deal with the matter in some other way, but we believed that that was the correct method of approach and we proceeded along those lines.

So that there may be no doubt as to that matter, I will quote the concluding words of