

Mr. BENNETT: I am coming to that. That was the condition of things until after the war. During the early stages of this development England, like other countries, entered upon an era of great prosperity, and it was believed that all was well because there was temporary prosperity. But one must look further than the immediate moment. In 1928 and 1929 I asked hon. members to pause and consider, to think where we were going, to look frankly at the situation created by the adverse balance of trade. There must be those who realize that the government heeded me not, and in the end we are paying the price which England is paying, except that being a new country and having arrested the flow of imports as we have, before it was too late we were able to overtake that adverse balance. When we came into power there was an adverse balance of \$100,000,000, which we have converted into a favourable balance as at the end of this year of over \$15,000,000. It is not for me to say, but one of the wisest economists the world now knows has affirmed that the achievement of Canada in this regard is the most important victory yet achieved against depression. I put it to the house whether or not the overcoming of an adverse balance of \$100,000,000 by ten millions of people was an easy task? Does anyone for one moment think that we did not have to disturb trade? It brought about a measure of instability when we required stability, it brought about unsettlement when we required steadiness; it did all these things, but they had to be done and the executive was clothed with power to do them. We got from parliament the power which enabled us to do it; we did it, and we will continue to do it as long as the emergency exists and necessity demands.

With so much of our trade policies does the right hon. gentleman agree, and with so much does he disagree. He says that on broad and general principles he desires Canadians to have an equal opportunity and fair competition, and that we should develop our great resources. If any hon. member of this house can suggest any method by which that can be accomplished other than by the use of tariff, I should be obliged to hear it. The late Marquis of Lansdowne, who at one time was Governor General of Canada, once said that where you had a protected world about you, where you were dealing with protected powers, it was like a man without a revolver entering a room in which everyone was armed; and he by training certainly was a free trader. That is the condition in which this country,

[Mr. Young.]

your country and mine, found itself when the present world crisis developed under the circumstances to which I have alluded. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, I ask this house, if they know of any method by which we could have accomplished what we set out to accomplish other than the method I have indicated.

If the right hon. gentleman means that we should have fair competition and equal opportunity, does he mean that we must do what was done a year ago last fall to give equal opportunity and fair competition to Canadians? There is no half way measure to be adopted. It was not a case of our desiring to do this; it was not that we had discovered some means by which we could apply this method here and that there; it was that we were convinced, as every thoughtful man in this house must be convinced, that unless we remedied the condition of an adverse trade balance of \$100,000,000 this country would be ruined. Because we did not desire to see it ruined, we, being in a position of responsibility, adopted the measures to which I have alluded. Is there any hon. gentleman here who objects to them? Is there any Canadian who objects to them? Is there any Canadian who does not believe that the obligations thrust upon the Canadian government by a world crisis must be discharged in the manner in which we have discharged them? Why did we seek legislation in 1930? Why did we seek it in 1931? Was it for the purpose of abusing it? Was it so that we might have power which, as the right hon. gentleman would have you believe, we intended to abuse? Was it for the purpose of substituting the executive for parliament? No. It was merely that we as the instruments of the people believed the government might be able to save this country from the impending crash which came in September last.

Incidentally to the discharge of these obligations we have improved employment in Canada. There are a hundred more industries in this country than there were when the present government came into power. From day to day various persons have sent communications to the government indicating the improvement that has been brought about in employment conditions. I do not for a single moment say that conditions are ideal; I have not suggested that, nor have I suggested that conditions have reached that measure of full prosperity which we desire. But I have said that the condition of this country is better than that of any other country in the world. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to read even to-night's paper and see the review