

Mr. BENNETT: What about similar factories on the Pacific coast?

Mr. YOUNG: The particular application to which I refer was sponsored by the factory in Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT: It was made on behalf of all the factories.

Mr. YOUNG: I have no doubt the factories on the coast would have been glad to share in the spoils.

Mr. STEVENS: They were behind the application.

Mr. YOUNG: They were not amongst the applicants when I saw them. It makes no difference because they are not entitled to assistance.

Mr. BENNETT: They could not be here when the hon. member saw them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Why would they not come? They were all invited.

Mr. YOUNG: What is a factory worth to Canada?

An hon. MEMBER: Where did the hon. member see them?

Mr. YOUNG: I saw them here in Ottawa. Tell us what a factory costs the country and we will tell you what it is worth.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the hon. member's business?

Mr. YOUNG: The cotton industry receives a protection of something like 27 per cent, and pays in wages about 20 per cent of its production cost. What does that factory cost Canada? It costs us 27 per cent and it pays in wages only 20 per cent. Is that a profitable industry for Canada? Are we justified in asking the people to patronize an industry like that?

Mr. BENNETT: Would the hon. member have it shut up?

Mr. YOUNG: We pay in protection more than the total wage bill.

Mr. BENNETT: Would the hon. member have it shut up?

Mr. YOUNG: They will not shut up.

An hon. MEMBER: How about the hon. member himself?

Mr. YOUNG: And I will not, either.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The Speaker of this house has been very insistent during the past week in maintaining in the house the very best deco-

rum. If hon. members insist upon interrupting the hon. member who has the floor they should at least have the courtesy to rise in a manner becoming to the decorum of the house.

Mr. YOUNG: This idea that by paying more for goods we have to buy we can employ more Canadian is about as ridiculous an idea as can be conceived. Take the boot and shoe industry. This industry receives a protection at the present time amounting to about 40 per cent. Suppose I go into a store to purchase a pair of boots for seven dollars; five dollars represents boots and the other two dollars represents duty. If I had seven dollars and could buy a pair of boots for five dollars without the duty, then I would have two dollars left with which I could probably buy a pair of rubbers and a pair of socks. Which will give more employment to Canadian labour, the making of a pair of boots or the making of a pair of boots plus the making of a pair of rubbers and a pair of socks? In the one case for your seven dollars, which is all you have to spend, you get a pair of boots; in the other case you get a pair of boots, a pair of rubbers and a pair of socks. Which will give the most employment to Canadian labour? The answer is quite simple. This talk of more employment being given to labour by allowing us to buy less for the money we have to spend is arrant nonsense.

I will not have much to say about the creed but—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan, Port Arthur): May I suggest to the hon. member that we are discussing an item covering publicity and advertising?

Mr. YOUNG: I ask only for the same treatment as that given to the minister himself. Every other hon. member of the committee has been permitted to discuss the substance of this advertising. To refer again to the creed, it says:

I believe in Canada.

I glory in the record of her achievements.

I have unbounded confidence in the ability of her people to excel in whatever they undertake.

I ask the Prime Minister this question: If he has such unbounded confidence in the ability of her people to excel, why is he afraid to let us go out and meet the world? Why does he build up these tariff restrictions around our shores? Is it because he has not faith in Canada and her people that he wants to put up these competitive tariffs and prevent us from meeting foreign manufacturers