

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not say it is a very dangerous thing, but I think that public opinion may change in England as it changed in 1849.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It may change in the United States as it changed in 1866.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: When you have a signed agreement with the United States it stands for a definite number of years.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It does with any country.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I will put a question to my right honourable friend. Let us say that we adopt this agreement. Does he really believe that a man like Lord Snowden, or Sir Herbert Samuel, or even Lloyd George—although I do not expect that he will ever again be Premier—would keep such an agreement intact?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Lord Snowden kept the McKenna duties intact long after he had threatened to throw them out.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: But he explained that they represented only a passing event.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: They were a long time in passing.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: And they were not so important as this agreement. They provided a mild measure of protection at a time when England was emerging from the War and feared that she might be mulcted by other nations. But let my right honourable friend not be misled into thinking that, when conditions become more nearly normal than they are just now, the old sentiment of freedom which made England such a powerful country in trade and otherwise will not revive. It is reviving at the present moment. Does he believe that if Lord Snowden were Chancellor of the Exchequer this agreement would remain on the Statute Book? For my part, I do not believe it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the honourable gentleman permit me to interrupt him? I should think the return of the Republican Party in the United States after a Democratic regime would be much more likely than the return of Lord Snowden to office in England.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not such a good judge of politics in the United States as I am of politics in the United Kingdom, because I am a Britisher.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He has been refused admittance to his own party.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: May I say to the right honourable gentleman that the people of the United States have learned a lesson during the last ten years. Republicans, as well as Democrats, realize to-day that the time is gone when the nation can be throttled with a tariff as high as the present one.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: It is not long since the United States raised a few of their tariff barriers.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: These treaties reduce tariffs.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Last April I sat in the Congressional gallery for a few hours and I was very much interested in the debates. I can assure honourable members that the unemployment situation was the chief topic of discussion and if the American Government has raised duties and taxes it has been by way of trying to meet heavy deficits. I heard the opinions of representatives of both sides, Republicans and Democrats, and I know that they were critical of high tariffs. And if honourable members will read the American press to-day they will find that the people of the United States are expecting a drastic reduction in their tariffs. There is a strong public opinion in that country to the effect that not only are the people over-taxed, but high duties have been the cause of their acute unemployment situation, and, in addition, have made the people of other countries unfriendly or indifferent to them.

My right honourable friend follows the activities of the League of Nations and knows that for the last four or five years the League has passed resolutions urging the reduction of tariffs in all countries, because it was felt that these trade barriers are a cause of international trouble. And only the other day some small nations—Belgium, Denmark—

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Holland.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: —and Holland, agreed among themselves to lower their tariffs. I am not going to discuss the agreement with the United Kingdom now, for I have barely had time to absorb it. I hope to have the opportunity of speaking when it comes before us for consideration. I shall not oppose it, as it represents the fiscal policy of the Government. I am here to pass judgment quietly on proposed legislation. But I have had some little experience in public affairs, and if I speak with some heat about any of the agreements that were made at the Conference, it is because I feel that there is no salvation from the economic ills from which our people are suffering except through a reduction in tariffs. Take our farmers, our