

the conduct of the business of this country by these gentlemen, the one denouncing the cotton, rubber and every other form of protected industry and the other saying that he is an out and out protectionist. Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce, whom I do not see in his place, is interested in an industry protected to the extent of 30 per cent.

An hon. MEMBER: Thirty-five per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: How can we expect to get any form of united action on the part of an administration thus constituted?

In 1922 the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) became a prophet. To his many delightful attributes he added that of prophecy, and in 1922, when speaking in this house, he ventured to say that the day was not far distant when the United States would abandon its mistaken idea with respect to protection, and that they would practise the doctrine of free trade as it was practised in England. Yet we know that within a few months after that statement was made legislation was enacted by the Congress of that great republic, the result of which was so apparent upon the exports from this country during the succeeding year. So whether one should take him as a prophet, as an enunciator of free trade principles, or as a new minister, it matters not, but one can readily understand why it was necessary for him to secure a dictionary definition as a justification of his faith.

The definition that he found was, "not narrow minded or prejudiced". That is the one he selected, and it is no wonder—he needed it. He knew that the Minister of Justice would not be narrow minded or prejudiced in taking him back into the fold, that he would not recall the days which are now long since forgotten. He knew the Minister of National Revenue would not be narrow minded or prejudiced in dealing with one who had returned to the fold, and he knew that the Minister of Trade and Commerce would look with pride and satisfaction upon the efforts made to bring back one sinner to the fold as being better than ninety and nine just men. So I understand why he selected that definition and why, in conscious pride, he justified his position by reference to that great work which I turned up and in which I found the definition he gave.

In days gone by this administration has been pleased to impose upon this house and upon this country certain tests of prosperity. It has said that if you apply to the conditions of the country certain tests and find the results to be satisfactory, the country must be prosperous. Last year the right hon. the

Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was pleased to intimate that Providence had been very careful in the selection of His instrument, and that he and the others about him had been chosen as the instruments of Providence to bring prosperous conditions to this country. Before I impose the tests I am about to mention, and which have been proposed by the former Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister himself, I will ask any hon. member of this house if he has been as prosperous in the past year as he was in the preceding years of his life. Is his condition as good? That is the question. Now, let us look at the tests imposed.

One of the tests imposed by the administration in former days was the railway earnings. It was proclaimed in loud tones that the earnings of the railways were a test of the great prosperity of the people. What about 1929? What about January, 1930? How do they compare with previous years? Let the minister answer that and explain the difference of millions of dollars. So by that test imposed by the government its claim must fail.

Then take the next test which they used to impose, the stock market prices. Who has not heard the Prime Minister talk about the high prices of stocks as compared with what they were in previous years? What does he say about them now? If we apply that test, is the country prosperous?

Then you turn to the third test that has been imposed, the cost of living that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) has worked so arduously to reduce. Yet when I turn to his report for the month of January last, I find there that the cost of living was 160 as compared with 100 in prewar times and it has alternated between 156 and 160 during all the years since the government came into power. One of the loudest declamations made by the Minister of Railways in days gone by was that the policy he proclaimed would reduce the cost of living. How, with the cost of living unreduced, does he now find himself in the family fold? That test must also be answered against the administration.

Then we turn to the next test, the balance of trade. Who has not heard of it? Why, last year, taking one of their speeches out of cold storage in western Canada, they forgot they were dealing with 1929 and thought it was a previous year, and they said: Canada has the greatest favourable trade balance of any country in the world but one. But while they were saying that, an adverse balance was running against Canada. Last year the adverse balance of trade in this country, taking domestic exports apart from foreign exports that pass through Canada, was \$116,000,000.