

Hinchliffe that Canadian export trade is not as good as it might be and that if he could do something to help that trade he would be doing something to help Canada at this time.

Mr. BLAIR: The creed in French is not the same as the creed in English. The hon. member for Algoma spoke of a French teacher approving of the creed in French, and I think the creed in French is very good in many ways, except as it tends to advertise the government. In the English version, however, I do not like the words "To the cause of her producers I pledge my devotion." The word devotion comes from the Latin "devoceo", which means to get down on your knees and worship. I believe in standing on my feet; we do not need to get down on our knees to worship the manufacturers. I do not think that expression is fair. It is ridiculous; it is absurd.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have nothing to say about the creed; possibly it may do some good. There may be some doubting Canadians whom my Conservative friends will convert by the creed. But what I object to is the expenditure of money on advertising Canadian goods in Canada. I am thoroughly in sympathy with advertising abroad, to help our merchants to market their goods outside Canada. But why two or three particular lines should be picked out and the Canadian people be urged to buy the products of these industries—this coming from the Conservative party particularly—is something the necessity for which I do not see. It is an absolute waste of the public money, for the reason that ever since this government took office they have been taking precious good care to see that no foreign goods shall come in. There is, therefore, no necessity for advertising. The people have no chance to buy anything but Canadian goods. Yet the government are spending \$90,000 in a campaign impressing upon the Canadian people the importance of buying these goods they cannot get anywhere else anyway. That, briefly, is the situation. Whenever the government hear of foreign goods coming in, they immediately pass an order in council raising the duty, with a resulting increase in price, so that it is an utter impossibility for the people to buy those goods. On that ground alone I object to this vote. The policy of the government is to keep out foreign goods. Then why squander \$90,000 telling the people to buy only Canadian goods when they cannot buy any other goods? That is the real objection to the vote.

Mr. YOUNG: I have no fault to find with a political party that spends its money prop-
[Mr. Hanbury.]

agating its ideas in an endeavour to persuade the people to adopt its views. In fact, I give a party credit for that; that is a legitimate use of campaign funds. But no one ever contemplated that any government or any political party would dip its hands into the public treasury to secure campaign funds.

Mr. PORTEOUS: Who paid for the advertisements that appeared before the last election under the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. YOUNG: Was there such advertising as this?

An hon. MEMBER: Worse.

Mr. PORTEOUS: They said, "Be Canadian; be British; vote Liberal."

Mr. YOUNG: If the Liberal party took money out of the treasury to advertise in the newspapers, urging the people to vote Liberal, they deserve censure. But that would not be an excuse for the present campaign of the Conservative party. I say that the Conservative party had the right to advertise so long as they did so with their own money. But they had no right to take public money to put on that campaign in the newspapers, to try to turn the people into Conservatives. That campaign, I believe, was put on through the Gibbons advertising agency of Toronto. An active executive and vice-president of the agency is Mr. G. M. Murray, whom some of you will remember as the man who became famous, perhaps I had better say infamous, about eleven years ago, for his attempts to bludgeon the Canadian press into supporting the protectionist campaign of the Conservative party. His plan at that time was to secure control of the advertising that was sent to the newspapers, and suggest to the editors that, in view of the fact that they were getting advertising, they should modify their editorial policy. I do not know what good angel guided my hand the other day when, in the library, I took down a book out of which fell this pamphlet I hold in my hand. It comprises a number of articles written during the campaign which Mr. Murray was carrying on in 1920, the series appearing under the title, "Plot to chloroform the Canadian Press." I wish to read one or two extracts from this pamphlet. Here is what Mr. Murray says in a letter which he addressed to some of the principal advertisers of that day:

Advertisers can talk politely to that editor to-day and they will be attentively listened to. The editor knows that advertisers form the one class who can save his enterprise from financial disaster, and anything those advertisers ask in