

done a great deal to assist the movement of goods north and south over the boundary. It will eventually prove, in my opinion, very beneficial to both countries.

When the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) was speaking the other day he discussed our trade, and in that connection I was reminded of a remark he made on a former occasion, when he said:

For we must commonly agree that there can be no continued sale without purchase.

Now if we once learn that, we are less likely to go astray. He went on, however, to show that the percentage of export trade in Canada during the last year exceeded the percentage of world export trade. He compared it to the year 1929, pointing out that the percentage of export trade in that year was 3·71; in 1930 it had dropped to 3·42; in 1931 to 3·29; in 1932 it was 3·78; in 1933 it was 3·59; in 1934, 3·99, an increase; and in 1935 it was 4·32. He pointed out at the same time that the imports had not quite followed the same trend; they were somewhat lower.

There is something unique about percentages, no matter how they are used. Sometimes percentages do not give a correct picture. I remember once a gentleman said that the increase in the export of horses to another country had gone up by 200 per cent; the previous year one horse went out of the country and the next year three were shipped out, and therefore there had been an increase of 200 per cent. I wish to put on Hansard detailed figures I have here from official sources showing our trade in the five years prior to and including 1930 and in the five years following 1930:

Exports	
Fiscal year:	
1926.. . . . .	\$1,328,700,137
1927.. . . . .	1,267,573,142
1928.. . . . .	1,250,598,034
1929.. . . . .	1,388,896,073
1930.. . . . .	1,144,938,070
1931.. . . . .	817,028,047
1932.. . . . .	587,565,517
1933.. . . . .	480,713,797
1934.. . . . .	585,654,469
1935.. . . . .	667,133,957
Imports	
Fiscal year:	
1926.. . . . .	\$ 927,328,732
1927.. . . . .	1,030,892,505
1928.. . . . .	1,108,956,466
1929.. . . . .	1,265,679,091
1930.. . . . .	1,248,273,582
1931.. . . . .	906,612,695
1932.. . . . .	578,503,904
1933.. . . . .	406,383,744
1934.. . . . .	433,798,625
1935.. . . . .	522,416,844

Total Trade	
1926.. . . . .	\$2,256,028,869
1927.. . . . .	2,298,465,647
1928.. . . . .	2,359,554,500
1929.. . . . .	2,654,575,164
1930.. . . . .	2,393,211,652
1931.. . . . .	1,723,640,742
1932.. . . . .	1,166,069,421
1933.. . . . .	887,097,541
1934.. . . . .	1,019,453,094
1935.. . . . .	1,189,558,801

In 1930 we had a total trade of \$2,393,211,652. In 1931 that had dropped to \$1,723,640,742, and by 1933 our total trade had dropped to less than \$1,000,000,000, in round figures \$887,000,000. By 1935 it had again increased to \$1,189,558,801.

I analyzed rather carefully what the leader of the opposition said in discussing our trade figures. He said that the balance of trade had been against this country, and secondly that the unemployment situation was very bad. I quote:

First of all, as has been pointed out in this house very frequently, we raised the tariffs. We certainly did. We raised tariffs in the fall of 1930 at the special session for a very deliberate and definite purpose. These tariffs were for certain given purposes. The purposes I have indicated. They accomplished the purposes for which they were enacted. True, they were emergency tariffs. We made it clear that that was so. True, it was purposed that in the end those tariffs should of course be reduced, but during the emergency.

I have already indicated the two purposes he had in mind, the balancing of trade and the correcting of the unemployment situation. He added:

It is true these measures did not provide employment for all the unemployed in the country. It is true that the numbers of unemployed increased greatly.

With regard to balanced trade, I think we may safely assume that that is a very unsafe factor on which to rely. If we had to do what was actually done our total trade would diminish as it in fact did diminish from \$2,393,000,000, in round numbers, to \$887,000,000. That is what happened under a policy of that kind, and I am afraid we must conclude that from the standpoint of balancing trade the policy carried out by hon. gentlemen opposite proved very unsatisfactory. And what is even more serious is the fact, which the right hon. gentleman admitted, that unemployment increased very considerably.

My hon. friends opposite say very frequently that they worry about reductions in the tariff by reason of the effect on employment. Their hearts bleed so for those in employment, and they are afraid that there will be less employment in Canada if tariffs are reduced. May I point out however—and