

question have never changed during the last twenty-five years. For fifteen years I have followed, approved and endorsed, the Laurier-Fielding tariff policy. During the last election I advocated that policy; I told the electors of Laurier-Outremont and I told the electors of the province of Quebec that if the Liberal party secured their confidence and was returned to power it would remain true to that policy and would carry it into effect through a revision of the tariff to meet the necessities which have arisen since the last revision, taking into account the interests of the consumer, of the farmer—whose industry we have always regarded as the basic industry of this country—and of the manufacturers in general. That policy I advocated before the general election, Mr. Speaker, at a dinner given in the city of Quebec, and at which the right hon. leader of the Opposition himself was a speaker. On that occasion, Sir, he applauded my declaration and made no such insinuations as those he made the other day.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Cerar), in his speech, quoted from the *Montreal Gazette* certain remarks that I made at a dinner held in connection with a convention of the shoe manufacturers of Canada. The hon. member seems to have found in my remarks a declaration tending toward an increase of duties on shoes imported into Canada. I am surprised that he made such a discovery, and if he has the patience to read that speech,—or re-read it, if he has not already done so—he will find that all I said may be summed up in the affirmation that it was the revision of the tariff of 1907 which brought to the shoe manufacturers of Canada that era of prosperity which they enjoyed until the recent crisis occurred which has affected their industries as it has affected all others in Canada. I reminded the Shoe Manufacturers' Association—and here I may say that these gentlemen have invested in their industry a capital of over \$32,000,000 and that they afford subsistence to some 70,000 of our people—I reminded them that what they had of prosperity they owed to the Laurier-Fielding tariff policy.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking of the railway question, endeavoured to convey the impression that some mysterious power had inspired those hon. members who expressed themselves as not believing in state ownership or state operation of railways. My right hon. friend has come out categorically in favour of the nationalization of our railways. He is sin-

cere in his views, I know; but why should he cast suspicion on those
5 p.m. hon. members who are not of the same opinion in the matter? As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) declared in his speech, there are on this side of the House, as there are on the other side, members who do not look upon state ownership or state operation of railways as practicable and profitable for the country. But we now own our railways and the Government has decided to give the system a fair trial under the best possible conditions. I cannot understand why my right hon. friend should doubt the good faith of the Government or of any of its members in that matter. The question is not one which concerns Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver or any city in particular; it is a question which concerns Canada as a whole, and the solution which we seek is a solution which shall be satisfactory to the interests of our country generally.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition has stated—and he has repeated the assertion several times—that his government was defeated by the big interests of Montreal. The interests that defeated my right hon. friend's government are the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, who voted to a man against the late administration and its followers, joined, as they were, by the majority of the Conservative electors of this country who by their vote and through their newspapers declared that they did not believe in the National Liberal-Conservative government. The power which defeated the late administration was the will of the Canadian people.

Referring to the remarks of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), who declared that the time had come when we should have responsible government in Canada and should cease administering the public affairs by Order in Council, the right hon. leader of the Opposition said: Every one of the Orders in Council that we passed was necessary for the good government of this country. He went on to say: You have a new Administration; you have already passed an Order in Council by which you deprive the Canadian Parliament of certain of its rights. Mr. Speaker, there were many Orders in Council passed by the government presided over by my right hon. friend and by the government which preceded it and of which he was a member. But although he declared that all these Orders