

cerned, I could conceive of no man better able than he to preside over a body of this kind; but I know, every hon. member knows in his heart that that gentleman has now more to do than he can possibly do, and to place upon his shoulders the interpretation of that report through these anaemic statutes and expect results is asking for the impossible. It cannot be done and it will not be done; do not let us make any mistake about that. We may go out to the country and say that we have set up a trade and industry commission; we may go out and speak in laudatory terms of the chairman and his colleagues—and one could not speak too highly to suit me—but as surely as the sun rises to-morrow, you have handicapped that individual and that commission to such an extent that it is an impossibility for them to give effect to the reforms indicated in this report. What is the use of our deceiving ourselves? I am speaking thus because I am profoundly convinced that we dare not leave these matters in their present form without a final word of protest.

Let me now refer briefly to the Liberal view as expressed in the minority report, and I want to pay this tribute to the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) with whose economic and social views I do not find myself in harmony at all—not that I do not respect him; he knows I do. But from my long acquaintance with him I know he will take words of criticism from me not as any personal reflection on himself or his party but simply as a conflict of ideas. The Liberal minority view is expressed in these words: it refers to the distress of the workers and it assigns that distress largely, and I think I might say almost wholly, to loss of external markets. I am not going to labour that point, but I wish to place very briefly in review the answer to that which I think is so definite there is no escape from it. It is not argument; it is fact. There is not in Europe a country that in the years between 1923 and 1935 did not erect almost insuperable barriers against most of the primary products that we desire to export. Two or three years ago I placed on Hansard the record, giving the dates, of the amendments to their tariffs. This had nothing to do with Canada; I do not blame those in power during those days. No one has ever heard me charge the right hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Mackenzie King) or his late Minister of Finance or my dear old friend who on account of ill health is so rarely in the house, the former Minister of Trade and Commerce, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Mal-

colm) at any time with their having lost Canadian markets, and I say to the leader of the opposition now—and he can use this on every hustings in Canada so far as I am concerned—I do not say that he was responsible for losing the markets; but I do say this: Wheat, oats, bacon, cheese, live stock, honey, flour and a lot of other things all had the duties against them in Italy, France, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Belgium and the United States raised steadily while he was in office. I appeal to the hon. member for Weyburn and in general to hon. gentlemen opposite: In the face of those facts, is it going to advantage the workers of Canada to say to them that the reason they are in their present dilemma is that this government has lost markets for Canada? It simply is not true; that is all. Do not let us go out to the country and say to the working man that restored markets are the cure. I will say this to the present government and I will say it to the leaders on the other side of the house: I will join with anyone at any time in an effort to get wider markets; but do not let us blind our eyes to the exact situation. In addition to loss of markets, there was dislocation of exchange. Is it not amazing that the night before last this house passed in a one, two, three, a bill setting aside some \$64,000,000 to stabilize exchange? Why did we not wake up to that need four years ago? It is this belated recognition of problems—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friends opposite say: "Hear, hear." Not the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie) who defeated me in the last election, because he has advocated stabilization, but I notice along the front benches hon. gentlemen who were very cautious about tampering with the monetary system of the country. But the point I make is this: here we are five years—well, from September, 1931, three and a half years—after Britain went off the gold standard when the question of exchange became an acute problem. After going through one year, two years, of depreciated sterling currency and disturbance of our trade with Britain in that respect; after all that, now we admit that exchange should be stabilized. It would have been infinitely better had we had the foresight to take that action at that time.

But I come back to the hon. member for Weyburn. The collapse of external markets, the closing of markets abroad, not by this government, not by the government that preceded it, but by the governments of Europe, and the dislocation of exchange, are what has