

continue to inquire concerning the lines of goods with which they have been familiar. In that way commercial relations are destroyed, and an attempt is made to build up trade among people estranged from each other. I say this transition will take years, and instead of trade improving it will no doubt suffer.

The price of cotton goods is very high. On linen used by poor people the tariff rate is over 60 per cent, but on the good quality linen used by wealthy people the duty is removed. How could hon. members explain to the farming communities that they had voted to raise the price of barbed wire and separators? Undoubtedly if we were permitted to vote on the different items we would be in a position better to express our views. The government has heard the cry of the world for lower tariffs. We know that the Prince of Wales and the Right Hon. Stanley Balwin have stated that the tariffs should be lowered. Farmers, labourers and all the poorer classes in the community realize that high tariffs are at least partly to blame for much of the poverty now existing. Tariffs act as a strong wedge to drive between the rich and the poor, so that the poor may be made poorer and the rich richer.

The agreement with which we are now dealing will be effective in raising the tariff, and for that reason I should not like to vote

for it. On the other hand, a British preference is offered, and for that reason alone I should like very much to vote for it. We must note however that it is binding for a five year period. Hon. members will see that the tariff on many articles used most frequently is three times as high under this agreement as under Liberal rule. Most emphatically I state that under the guise of a British preference the treaty is intended to raise tariffs. I could not return to my constituency with a knowledge that by my vote I had sanctioned a duty three or four times as high as under the régime of the late government on articles used by farmers' wives. When the Liberals were in power the prices of cottons, woollens, shoes, wire, carpets, blankets and overcoating were too high. We know however that at that time the prices of other commodities were also high. Now the tariff is raised three times as high. Who can afford to buy at such prices? We are not on a parity with the English pound; when we sell a dollar's worth we receive only seventy-five cents. On what can the farmer depend when for a period of five years he has to buy under increased tariffs?

Let us for a moment survey tariff rates: The following table will serve to compare the rates as they obtained in 1930, after the short session of 1931, after the ordinary session of 1931 and the present rate:

	Regular Session 1930	Short Session 1931	Regular Session 1931	Present Rate
523a White cotton flannelette.	16	31	63	60½
523b All cotton printed piece goods.	19	32½	63½	60½
523 Cotton pillow cases.	16	33½	64½	62½
523 Cotton sheets.	16	34½	66	62½
523 Cotton towels.	15	36½	69	66
554 Wool piece goods (grays).	11	33½	64½	61
Wool fabrics (overcoating).	25½	76½	122	106
Wool hosiery.	23	58½	97½	89½

The articles covered by these items are those most frequently bought by farmers' wives. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) has said that the farmer's wife will in the year 1932 receive 18 or 19 cents for her butter on the English market. I wonder if the increased price will make up the difference she has to pay on the price of a cream separator.

The time stipulated for the operation of the agreement is, in my view, much too long. The intention of the government is that we will have to accept the tariff changes, and that the farmers and villagers will have to pay high prices for their purchases, regardless of the prices they may receive for the products they have for sale. A nation which adheres to [Mr. Blair.]

this treaty is like a farmer in a community who proclaims that he will not deal with or exchange with his neighbours, but will deal with his brothers who live many miles away. Now this farmer has dealt with his neighbours for many years; is it wise to proclaim to them that if they are going to trade with him or his brothers they will have to pay tribute? Such an attitude provokes war. Would it not be better for the brothers to gather at the father's home at Yuletide and inquire how they can help one another, buy from each other, sell to each other, exchange with each other as much as possible, yet keep a kindly spirit towards all their neighbours? We cannot do without friends nor can we so easily do without neighbours. Let us retain both friends and neighbours.