

the loom and across by the woof. The Dominion Textile Company, true to form, got their warp and woof into these tariff schedules, and they have so arranged the tariff that they will be able to control the whole situation. But that is always what comes out of higher and higher tariffs.

There is not a man in this country, no matter what his politics may be, nor how prejudiced he may be towards any political party, who is not in favour of more empire trade. But there has been a disposition among hon. gentlemen across the floor during this debate—and occasionally they give utterance to it—to say almost in so many words, or to insinuate that anyone who dares to criticize this agreement and this treaty is helping to disrupt the British Empire. There was a time when perhaps the Tory party could get away with that in Canada, but that time is gone, and if they have no better argument with respect to these agreements than an insinuation of that kind, they had better not attempt to say anything at all.

I come from a western Ontario riding which is largely rural, and I wish to say here that there is not a single solitary member on the other side representing a rural riding in western Ontario who has got up and defended the agreements. I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman can take the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the other side, coming here as they do by the votes of farmers—because that is how they came in, on the promises made in 1930. I am not going to go back to that, however. They must know that the farmers in their constituencies are opposed absolutely to these agreements because they contain nothing for them. I should like to read from an article entitled "Three Centuries of Empire Trade" by a professor of Queen's university. If I had the time at my disposal I should like to put the whole article upon Hansard, but I will read only part. I may say that on the whole I agree with what is said in this article, although perhaps not in every particular. It reads:

The veil has lately been torn from our eyes. The people of England have been very definitely told that we do not want empire trade for the sake of empire but for the sake of cash. We all now know exactly where we stand. By and large, it is where we have always stood, that is, on the solid base of self-interest. But this base is for the first time officially proclaimed and its proclamation undoubtedly marks a turning point of empire. It marks the completion in the economic sphere of that evolution with which the last prime minister had a good deal to do in the political sphere, the evolution of nationhood.

Is the proclamation for better or for worse? Some facts are better left un-faced. Open confession is not always good for the soul. The

material out of which any political entity is compounded always contains a liberal proposition of—dare one appropriate Mr. Thomas's term?—"humbug." Our sentiments never exactly fit the facts. In the political world parity of thought is like high explosive and perhaps the greatest statesman is he who recognizes the essential common sense of humbug. We have been told that if we do not grasp the present economic opportunities offered to us—whatever those may be—our empire will go the way of the empires of the past. This may be a simple prediction, in which case it is likely to prove false; or it may be a threat, in which case the last nail is being driven into the coffin whose construction was begun by the Tory annexationists of Montreal some eighty years ago. No one can prove that the existence of empires depend on official trade relations between their component parts. Indeed history suggests that if any general principle emerges, it is just the opposite, that empires go to pieces from the irksomeness and the injustices of official interference in trade and from the greed for which they are the transparent cloak.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is the author?

Mr. SANDERSON: Professor A. R. M. Lower.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member was never his pupil.

Mr. SANDERSON: Under the terms of the agreement with the United Kingdom, free entry into Canada is given to linens. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said the other night that we have handed over the linen market to the Irish linen manufacturer. Does he not know that the Irish linen manufacturer has had this market for the last seventy-five years? We do not make any linen in this country and there is very little fine linen made in the United States, for reasons which I have not the time to go into. If there is any article upon which we should impose a tariff for revenue, it is linen. This article is purchased by the rich to put upon their tables, the ordinary man in this country thanks God if he has a table without any table cloth on it. He does not want to and cannot buy linens, and this article should be protected.

There are other articles which have been placed upon the free list, such as fishing tackle and bagpipes, but cream separators, except from Great Britain where we do not buy any, have had duties placed against them. How can hon. members from western Ontario ridings defend a duty of twenty-five per cent on cream separators with the dairying industry in the terrible position it is today? Hon. friends opposite were going to improve this industry, they were going to have butter bring seventy cents per pound, but how can they justify duties of twenty-five per cent on