

tries lagged behind in the formation of a national government, and that the problems of Canada could not be solved except by cooperation of the two great parties in the state and that if they failed to do so the progress of Canada could not fail to be retarded. I ask this question especially for two reasons: first, because Sir Edward Peacock has been mentioned as a possible governor of the new Bank of Canada, and, secondly, because when I withdrew my motion of want of confidence in the present administration the other evening in order to expedite the business of the house, I had not expected to see what is the equivalent of a want of confidence motion in my right hon. friend's government made at a Dominion day dinner given in London under the auspices of the High Commissioner for Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: The vote of want of confidence was in any dominion government the right hon. gentleman might form as well. It is observed he was pleading for a national government. Such a distinguished man as Sir Edward Peacock represents neither the right hon. gentleman nor myself. I knew nothing of his speech. When I saw in the newspaper that he was to speak I was awaiting the report of it in the daily press this morning.

So far as the other question is concerned I should like to inform the right hon. gentleman and the country that Sir Edward Peacock's commitments in London in the great position that he occupies would preclude the possibility of his accepting the position of governor of the Bank of Canada if he had been offered it. He has not been offered it either tentatively or otherwise, so I think I have answered all the questions the right hon. gentleman has suggested.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would the Prime Minister approve what Sir Edward Peacock has said?

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps I might ask the right hon. gentleman what he thinks about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think almost any government would be better than the present one.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, I fancy the right hon. gentleman means what he says, that in his opinion any government would be better than the present one. I can also say that I can conceive none that would be as bad as the one that he would create.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The right hon. gentleman may have an opportunity of seeing the effect of a change before long.

Item agreed to.

Trade and Commerce—

Commercial Intelligence Service, including miscellaneous expenditure in connection with Canada's trade—further amount required, \$50,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This afternoon I told the Prime Minister that I was becoming so desirous of having prorogation that I was going to waive any discussion on this particular item under the heading of Commercial Intelligence Service. With the understanding that he will give me three minutes to correct two or three mistakes I thought he was correcting me in shortly after lunch, I will waive any claim here. He made what I thought were three corrections of mistakes I made, one with regard to the embargo on Russia being in 1931. Well, the order in council was. What I intended to say was that the legislation authorizing the embargo was passed at the special session in 1930 as it was. That was about when Russia got up in the air; it was not when the order in council went through; it was when the authority was passed by this parliament to impose an embargo on any country that was not a contracting party to the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. BENNETT: But Russia signed the agreement.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Russia was not mentioned in this legislation, but everybody knew to whom it referred. We are getting bolder in these matters now. When we want to talk about the Doukhobors we say that the Doukhobors are to be disfranchised, so the government is getting worse instead of better in that respect. Russia signed the agreement but not the quota. Well, what was the agreement without the quota? The quota was the crux of the whole matter, so I think my statement was absolutely correct.

The next mistake mentioned by the Prime Minister was that any offer that China had made to sell wheat would have been at a loss to Canada of from ten to twenty cents a bushel. The government should not be waiting for people to come round to make offers to them at this time. They should be out merchandising wheat and even if they had lost ten or fifteen cents a bushel, they have lost more than that on the storage of this wheat in the last three years with the wheat still unsold.

Mr. BENNETT: I merely say that the government has substantial credit at present-day prices of wheat.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is that—a substantial credit?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.