

in political party discussion here. I think every member of this House will agree with me that this is not the place for such discussions, and certainly this moment is not the time for it. On this side of the House—and I think the same thing may be said of the Opposition side in another place—the measures of government have been dealt with on their own merits. So far as I have been able to follow proceedings, there have not been in the other House any discussions from the party point of view. Certainly there have been none here. I think my honourable friend has made a mistake. I hope he will pardon me for saying so, but I am doing this in the very best spirit, and I think he will agree with me when he considers the matter. I refer to it not with the intention of finding fault, or for any purpose of that kind, but only because I think it the duty of some of us, whether on this side or the other, to protest against any discussion along party lines in this Chamber. Nothing will be gained by it. If some honourable member on this side of the House should be provoked into replying to my honourable friend, what might be the result? For one thing, it might delay the passing of legislation and thereby prevent what we all are striving to facilitate, the attendance of the Prime Minister and his colleagues at the Imperial and Economic Conferences. My honourable friend and I are now and always have been good friends, and I hope he will not think badly of me for what I have said. I have protested at this time, and on previous occasions when I considered it necessary, because I feel that those of us who have been members of this Chamber for many years should endeavour to make it clear that political discussions are out of place here. That is the rule, and I can say I have always tried strictly to observe it.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: If I am permitted, perhaps I should plead guilty to a certain extent—

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: Two dollars and costs.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: —at least, for expressing myself with a certain degree of heat; but perhaps I might offer by way of excuse the example of my honourable friend from Lethbridge (Hon. Mr. Buchanan), who opened the door pretty wide.

Hon. R. DANDURAND: I am not eager to enter into this discussion, which seems to be closing somewhat strenuously, but I should like to say that I do not think it is quite proper to accuse others of insincerity. I represented the late Government in this Chamber

for more than eight years, and I sat in Council with my colleagues. If the honourable gentleman from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) desires to give credit to the Conservative party, on the ground that it has lived up to its principles, may I remind him that the Liberal party has always been true to a policy that tended towards a reduction in customs duties? I say "reduction," because that party has never advocated free trade. It has tried, rather, to keep the tariff at certain levels which would encourage freer trade than is possible under high protection. How can my honourable friend impute insincerity to a Liberal Government that lived up to the principles proclaimed at the convention of the Liberal party in 1919? The late Government during its nine years in office was largely successful, by the putting into force of Liberal principles, in its attempt to increase the prosperity of this country. Up to September, 1929, our industries were flourishing, as is well known to my honourable friend, who is deeply interested in many industrial concerns and keeps his eye on the stock market. I would remind him that during the last five years certain industries were so prosperous that their stock was quoted at a figure that would yield a return of hardly 3 per cent, although at par the rate would be 6 per cent or more. It was the very prosperity of industry in general that brought about the extraordinary incentive to speculation, and the good times that prevailed were reflected on the stock exchange in all classes of stocks—in cotton as well as other stocks. The large profits, dividends and reserves of those years all indicated that the then Government had successfully co-operated in the development of trade, not only domestic, but foreign as well.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: It reduced duties.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I shall not repeat what I said on the Address, but perhaps I may refer briefly to the remarks I made at that time. I pointed to the state of the country when the late Government came into power in 1921, and to its accomplishments during its term of office, and I asserted that if the election had been held in the summer of 1929, before the world-wide depression had extended to this country, that Government would have been returned. Honourable members on both sides of the House have admitted that unemployment and reduced business in Canada have resulted from an international situation, over which we had no control. What justification, then, can my honourable friend, or anyone else, have for saying that the late Government deliberately