

sought by a multitude of words to cover up that lack. Not only does this inconsistency appear in his remarks, but it is present in the statements of various hon. members opposite. The leader of the opposition stated that this government forced the government of the United Kingdom to change its fiscal policy; the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) stated that the government of the United Kingdom forced this government to take the stand which it did take in connection with these agreements. The leader of the opposition stated that the government of the United Kingdom forced Canada to a tariff investigation; in one breath he worried at the increased price to the consumer in the United Kingdom and in the next he complained that the farmers of Canada who were to supply the foodstuffs to the consumers of the United Kingdom would receive no benefit. The leader of the opposition referred to a speech which he delivered at Seaford during the South Huron election in which he outlined his attitude towards the agriculturists. I have read the press in this connection and the only statement referring to agriculture made by the right hon. gentleman was that he could not express an opinion on these agreements because all he knew was what agriculture obtained from them. If, as he stated there, his great concern was agriculture, surely it was not necessary to delay saying something of approval. He intimated that agriculture at least was receiving something. The right hon. gentleman has stated that he does not believe in bargaining, but rather in negotiation. I have looked up a number of dictionaries and I find that "to negotiate" means "to bargain." I think the best description that could be given of the right hon. gentleman's attitude towards this whole debate is that it is a matter of words, and very often words of the same meaning.

In connection with this same inconsistency we have one of the right hon. gentleman's chief lieutenants suggesting to the government that in negotiating the St. Lawrence waterway treaty it would have been well to try to make a deal with the United States for a decrease in the tariff against fish from the maritimes. That is a straight case of bargaining. We have the spectacle of the leader of the official opposition and one of his chief lieutenants taking opposite attitudes in the same debate. The leader of the opposition stated that the Liberals never have advocated protection, yet the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Moore) has said that he is a protectionist.

Time will not permit my giving more details of this series of contradictions, but

[Mr. R. Weir.]

perhaps the best example of all is this: There is sitting in the ranks of the opposition an hon. gentleman who has always stood high in his party, who has always been recognized as one of the most astute politicians in the ranks of the Liberals—I refer to the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell), my predecessor in office. What has he stated? He accuses the government of "swiping" in broad daylight the policies of his party, yet his leader made the following statement, which appears on page 274 of Hansard:

Mr. Speaker, I say the principle embedded here is wholly indefensible and is undeserving of any support from any part of the British Empire.

One hon. member accuses us of stealing their policies which, according to the description of his leader, are indefensible and undeserving of any support.

After listening not only to this debate but to the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne I have come to the conclusion that it is eminently fair to say that there is one thought which runs through the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, delivered both in and out of this house and appearing in the press, and that is that attempts should have been made to obtain wider markets by the reduction of tariffs. This has been their refrain, both in and out of season. No definite, specific example has been given as to how this will be brought about; just general statements have been made. The climax of all these speeches was, I think, reached in the remarks of the leader of the opposition when on Monday last he took part in this debate. He worked very cleverly up to this climax; his words were well chosen; he was the actor who was trying to impress not only the members of the house, but also and perhaps more particularly the people in the country, and his climax was reached with almost a look of anguish on his face as he uttered these words: "I feel the dark shadows of the closing gates." The leader of the opposition did not tell us where those gates were situated, but I think, in observing the look of anguish on his face, he was perhaps referring to the dark shadows of those closing gates placed at the exit of the valley of the shadows of humiliation, and he was on the wrong side. If, however, he had reference to the gates of commerce, I am free to admit, as I am sure the majority of the people of this country must admit that, no other member of the house can speak with greater authority on the question of the closing of the gates of commerce, because more was done to close the gates of commerce