

The leader of the opposition, in his three and a half hour speech, I think proved conclusively that our leader is a great statesman and a great force in the empire today. In that speech the leader of the opposition, I consider, eulogized the Prime Minister when he said that my leader had dominated the conference of 1930; that he had dominated the conference in Ottawa in 1932, coercing Great Britain, forcing them to change their tariff policy, and dictating the tariff policies of other dominions. No greater compliment could be paid from the other side of the house to our Prime Minister. In fact, he placed the Prime Minister on a pedestal as being a great statesman and a leader. Surely then, we have reason to believe the statement made by Sir Cunliffe Lister in the city of Regina, when I had the honour and pleasure of listening to him address a joint meeting of the Canadian Club and the board of trade, and when he said that credit for the success of the conference must be given to the Prime Minister of Canada; for it was his vision in 1930, his vision again in 1932, in placing concrete propositions before the conference, that formed the basis of the agreement. We have also the statements of leading British statesmen such as Lord Hailsham and Lord Rothermere; and another leading statesman in Great Britain said that at last the empire had found a statesman. Let us briefly compare all the statements of these British statesmen and the leader of the opposition with that made by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) when he referred in his speech to the present Minister of Agriculture. He desired to express sympathy for him because he said that his associates around the council chamber were a lot of ignoramuses who do not know any more about agriculture than a sucking turkey. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten for the moment just where he was. He must have been thinking he was back on his farm in Saskatchewan, possibly in the hog pen or the poultry yard. I am sure none of the members on this side of the house understand what a sucking turkey is, but evidently it is a species produced by him while he was minister of agriculture. He need not waste his sympathy on the present Minister of Agriculture, because the latter, in the two short years during which he has held that office, has done more for agriculture, has initiated greater improvements in agricultural matters, than the hon. gentleman opposite has done in almost a lifetime. Further, I take exception to any reference to any hon. member, and particularly a member

of the cabinet, as being an ignoramus. Such expressions are not becoming the dignity of the house. I have gone through the speech of the hon. member for Melville, and in the forty minutes he took, some of the terms he used are as follows: "political mummies," "taradiddle," "same old humbug," "ignoramus," "sucking turkey," "flim-flam," "warbling of Prime Minister," "nonsensical political trick." These terms were all used in his forty-minute speech, and one can well see why his leader, having a policy of Senate reform, did not designate him to that dignified chamber.

It is expected in the country generally and by the government that the administration will receive just and reasonable criticism from the opposition, but during this whole debate we have not heard a single constructive idea or suggestion from the official opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): Hon. members may laugh. These agreements are achievements, and possibly the greatest step in the direction of consolidating this empire than anything that has yet been accomplished. I think all will agree that the stabilization of the business of this empire will do more to rebuild the world's economic structure than anything else that can happen. In proof of that I quote from an article in a paper to which I think the opposition will not object, the *Toronto Globe*, which on October 15 said:

If these trade agreements do nothing more than shock the world and get it out of its somewhat fatalistic submission to depressed conditions, it will have accomplished more than any other possible agency. If they show the need of exercising industrial ingenuity and dexterity, or, as in the case of South American nations, lead to concerted action to meet the new contingencies, the benefit cannot help being far-reaching. In the meantime they have begun a new epoch in intra-Empire relations, in both unification and trade, which, it is to be hoped, means increasing helpfulness and development which the rest of the world can challenge only by adopting more liberal policies than now prevail.

In an issue of a later date the *Toronto Globe* says that it regrets Canada did not do what New Zealand has done, namely, pass these trade agreements promptly and without parliamentary debate.

I quote also the *Winnipeg Free Press*, which hon. gentlemen opposite will surely agree with me is not a great friend of this government. The *Winnipeg Free Press* calls these trade agreements "a definite step in the right direction." In Great Britain, parliament within a very few days of convening passed several