

sonably request us to sanction these agreements. At all times, we, in the opposition, have always been opposed to high protection, and this pact is founded on that principle which, in the past, was found lacking and is now the cause of the most serious economic and financial crisis existing throughout the world and threatens the peace and security of nations. For the last two years, we have been living, in Canada, under a regime of high protection. In 1930, this government succeeded in getting into power, after touring the country, chanting its favourite hymn "High protection; Canada First." Through this policy, the country was to return to prosperous days; unemployment was to cease; our trade would develop; our Canadian producers would find markets to sell their products; our domestic markets would be exclusively restricted to our products through the medium of a tariff wall shutting out completely all foreign goods.

What was the result? I put the question to you, sir, and to all our hon. friends on the opposite benches. It was nil, absolutely so, and our country is suffering from the most dire distress. The people are downcast and threaten to rebel if a change of regime does not take place.

I would have imagined that the government taking heed of the past, would have understood that its policy was disastrous to the country and that instead of persisting in such a policy, it would have adopted other methods, but no, it wishes to apply this policy to the whole British Empire. These agreements which the government wants us to approve afford us the most convincing proof of this. To attain their aim our opponents charge us with being disloyal to the British Empire. The government must be short of arguments to make such a charge for it knows perfectly well that if there is a party which has given proof of its loyalty to the empire, it is certainly the Liberal party. If England, in the past, has been favoured by a preferential tariff, it is the Liberal party that granted it to her, notwithstanding the protest of hon. gentlemen opposite. Our opponents distort the truth when they charge us with not wanting to trade with the commonwealth; basing our stand on the principle of liberty, while at the same time having due respect for the autonomy of each dominion, we have never favoured a preference which would close all the world markets, to us, and it is this preference that this government grants to the British Empire by raising the intermediary and general tariffs, which would completely close foreign markets to our products. If we desire

[Mr. Denis ]

a greater expansion in trade with the British Commonwealth, we also desire to trade with our neighbours, the United States, which, whatever may be said to the contrary, is the natural market for our products. The world will one day realize that a tariff war can but produce one result: that of bringing ruin and distress into the country which resorts to it. Our neighbours to the south have begun to realize this fact, and in a nearer future than is expected, we may be able to negotiate with the United States a trade treaty advantageous to Canada.

Let us examine these agreements which are submitted for our approval, and let us weigh the advantages which Canada will derive, in the light of her trade and future development. I wonder whether I am prejudiced, for I find that our country receives very little in comparison with the favours we grant to the commonwealth.

John Bull with his cunning diplomatic ways has succeeded, once again, in fooling our Prime Minister, by grabbing the lion's share. The former had already met our Prime Minister at the Imperial Conference, in 1930; he had sized him up and knew what should be done to secure from him all concessions favourable to England.

I shall not delay the house by examining each item separately. Speakers who preceded me in this debate did so, and I, therefore, do not see the necessity of once more going over the whole matter; moreover the house is sufficiently acquainted with their purport. However, permit me, sir, to draw the attention of the house to certain Canadian products which seem, according to our opponents, to have been favoured by these agreements, and which, on the contrary, are subjected to restrictions which did not exist under the Liberal regime. I refer to eggs, butter, cheese, poultry and all dairy products. It is stipulated in these agreements that so far as these products are concerned, after the lapse of three years the government of the United Kingdom may revise the principle on which rests this preference and regulate the flow of these products, as it may deem proper. I do not know whether one can find any advantage in such restrictions. I think that our government has been over zealous; it should have made the same reservation when it granted to the products of the United Kingdom a preference liable to ruin a number of our small industries which have just started.

Article 4 reads as follows:

It is agreed that the duty on either wheat in grain, copper, zinc or lead as provided in