

devoted about six pages to this agreement and made seven major criticisms and about twice as many minor criticisms of the agreement before it was brought down. That proves to me conclusively that the leader of the opposition and his party had decided, whatever their motive may have been—it may have been for the benefit of their party; I do not know—before even the agreements were presented to the house to oppose them in their entirety.

The great diversity of opinion as to these agreements among the official opposition cannot escape notice. At one end of the line we have had the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young), who is the extreme exponent in this house of the principles of Cobden and Bright, and at the other end of the line we have had a very moderate speech delivered by a manufacturer opposite, a protectionist, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). From another angle we have had the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), who leads the Liberal party in Ontario, and who described his own position last year as swinging well to the left. Then we had the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Moore), who I think we can say, judging from the very moderate speech he delivered the other day, swings a reasonably far distance to the right. Within those four corners we have had a great diversity of opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite. The leader of the opposition, of course, in fiscal matters as in practically everything else adopts the Laodicean attitude; he is neither hot nor cold, but takes a middle course and proclaims himself a believer in the principle of tariff for revenue only. I think that perhaps explains this great diversity of opinion among his followers, as well as his habit of making such long speeches on every question he discusses, because he has to have something to suit every element in his party, so that each of his supporters can point to one paragraph when they go back home to their constituents and say that that shows they are consistent followers of their leader.

During the course of the debate there have been many criticisms from the official opposition of the protective principle embodied in these agreements. They have criticized that protective principle from every angle and have coupled with their criticism many severe attacks on the manufacturing industries of our country. I think that these attacks really culminated in the speech which the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) delivered the other evening when he quoted with great gusto the statement made by a

[Mr. Shaver.]

Manchester exporter referring to the two-penny, half-penny manufacturers of eastern Canada. He rolled that statement as a sweet morsel under his tongue. It apparently expressed his own ideas.

Mr. McPHEE: Hear, hear.

Mr. SHAVER: I wish to say to the hon. gentleman that there are several manufacturing industries in the county I have the honour to represent, and we have four thousand men and women who make a living in those industries. May I add that no class of people in Canada during these troublous times has made greater sacrifices to prevent unemployment and keep the wheels of industry turning to help the men and women of this country make a decent living than the manufacturers of Canada. If the member for Yorkton will come down to my county some weekend and give me the opportunity I will show him over some of the finest and best equipped manufacturing establishments that can be found anywhere in the world, and then I do not think he will again refer to our manufacturers as two-penny half-penny.

I wish to quote a paragraph from a speech delivered in this house ten years ago. It will be found in Hansard of 1922 at page 2658. It was delivered by a member of the government coming from the province of Quebec, one for whom I always had a very high respect. I always read his speeches, and his views on fiscal matters were very much in accord with my own. I refer to Sir Lomer Gouin, who, ten years ago, said this about the manufacturing industries of Canada:

I think I know the good old province of Quebec as well as any Canadian and I say without any hesitation that what has contributed in a very large measure to make our province prosperous and our farmers satisfied with their lot is the fact that our manufacturers have supplied our farmers with a market where they can sell their products, and what I say for Quebec must be true, and it is true, of every province of this dominion where there are manufacturing establishments.

That statement by Sir Lomer Gouin is just as true in the province of Ontario as in the province of Quebec. Particularly is it true in the county I have the honour to represent.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly those of the Liberal opposition, have referred particularly to the textile industry, and have attacked the cotton schedules. As I stated before there are three cotton mills in my constituency in which are employed about 1,500 people. For that reason I believe it to be my duty to correct some of the exaggerations and misrepresentations which have been placed before the house and the country.