

found it highly desirable or he would have kept him here. That is the only conclusion that can be reached.

I have indicated the situation we have in this country to-day, and I have endeavoured to apply the tests to which I have alluded to the conditions as they exist. I have shown that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) in Brantford a few days ago, in strong and vigorous terms, declared his supreme confidence in the doctrine of protection. I have endeavored also to show how the Minister of Railways and Canals had declared that protection was really something which was injurious to the state, that he believed in free trade as a principle and believed that that principle would be adopted shortly by most countries of the world.

As the Kincardine Review-Reporter, the home journal of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has paid him such a beautiful tribute in saying that he resembles a Greek god, I would be very lacking in courtesy if I did not also pay him a tribute, as one would expect almost anything from a Greek god. He is an avowed protectionist; not only does he believe in it but he practises it.

May I point out that the Minister of Finance newly appointed has announced to the people of this country in great, flaring headlines that "Dunning upholds low tariff principles."

Mr. DUNNING: That is right.

Mr. BENNETT: And he now reiterates that statement. Then I almost forgot my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) who sounded the death knell of protection.

I put to this house this query: Can a government function properly, effectively and efficiently in a country like Canada where you have such divergent views held by the leading ministers? What sort of management would you have in a railroad if you had one director with one policy, another director with another policy, and so on, a difference in policy affecting the very fundamentals of the existence of that corporation? Has the Minister of Railways and Canals recanted? Will he make his recantation now? Will he say that he has been wrong? Will he say that when he endeavoured to lead the Progressives into the land of promise it was only promises that he had in mind? Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce say that the farmer is entitled to only one per cent protection on dairy products while he himself is entitled to thirty per cent? Will the Minister of National Revenue say to the people of this country that poultry, eggs, and various dairy products

[Mr. Bennett.]

should receive only from one to seven per cent protection while furniture receives thirty-five per cent?

Mr. MALCOLM: Thirty per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: You would make it thirty-five per cent if you had the chance. Will the hon. gentleman, with a rubber factory in his own town of Kitchener, say to the people of his own constituency that the rubber industry is not indigenous to Canada and should be wiped out? Will the hon. gentleman who has just succeeded the late member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. O'Connor) go back to the people of Valleyfield and say that the Minister of Railways and Canals is right and that the cotton industry should be wiped out and that it is affording employment to a few hundred people only? Will the Minister of Justice go back to Quebec and read what the Minister of Railways and Canals has said about boots and shoes?

These are the questions which the people are asking themselves. Is this government sincere? Is there any unity of purpose or thought in their minds? We know that there is no unity of thought, and there is no unity of purpose except to retain the promised land. Is there any unity of purpose or policy? If so, what is it? Is it anything more than to stay in office and retain power? That is the question, and I have a right to ask it.

I have gone over this speech from the throne and indicated what conditions are and I do not think that anyone can say that I was not within the facts. This country is confronted with the situation of an adverse trade balance for last month of over \$10,000,000. The United States figures show that we purchased last year nearly \$1,000,000,000 from that country. What are you going to do about it? What about the adverse balance of trade with reference to butter, cheese and dairy products? What about bacon? What about hams? What about pork, and similar products? A carload of eggs and a carload of pork products came into Calgary the other day from the United States. Is that to continue? What about vegetables and fruit? What about market garden products? Is it true that the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Quebec has been promised that legislation affecting those products will be passed this session? I commend to my hon. friend from Weyburn (Mr. Young) the report of that hon. gentleman. Has assurance been given, as is freely stated in the province of Quebec, that such legislation as will protect the market gardener will be enacted at this session of parliament?