

ceremonies that were taking place in Ottawa, to the bells as they were chimed at three forty-five o'clock in the afternoon, in the tower of this building. In that remote village—

Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife—

—I listened to the carillon of Canada in the tower of our parliament building, and I felt, as I say, a double loyalty. There was that loyalty within me which one derives from one's younger ideals and associations with the literature and traditions, and the splendid story of old Scotland. As Scotland's national poet said, referring to his own younger days:

E'en then a wish I mind its power
A wish that to my latest hour
Shall strongly heave my breast,
That I for puir old Scotia's sake
Some usefu' book or plan could make,
Or sing a sang at least.

But now there is the other loyalty, the loyalty to this Dominion of Canada, this broad and generous dominion, with its decent and its dauntless people, the loyalty which is expressed in the admirable lines of Sir John Willison:

Oh bounteous land; oh generous inspiration
That floods the morning of the world to be,
That people are the builders of a nation,
Lofty, benignant, free.

Now, sir, the best that there is in these twin loyalties is absolutely destroyed, abrogated, dispelled and ruined by the agreements that have been arrived at as a result of the Imperial economic conference.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I like "fat men . . . sleek men, such as sleep o' nights."

Mr. GOTT: The vacillation of the hon. member is not only amusing but is becoming alarming.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver). My first objection to this agreement is that it contradicts the very spirit of the conference itself, which was to lower tariffs rather than to raise them. For an agreement, which is to be binding as between the United Kingdom and Canada, to involve increases in the Canadian tariff against the rest of the world in respect of 138 items, is, in my humble opinion, little short of a tragedy. I shall never forget the thrill and inspiration I got listening to the words of Stanley Baldwin on the opening day of the conference, when he said that, so far as the British delegation was concerned, the hope of that delega-

tion was to develop a system which would tend towards a lowering of world tariff barriers. Do these agreements carry out that hope? With all deference to a man for whom I have the highest respect—I refer to the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin—I say that there is not the slightest scintilla of evidence in the four corners of the agreement that the prophecy as to lowering world tariff barriers has been fulfilled. I should like the Prime Minister, when he concludes this debate, to answer this question: Was it true, as stated by the correspondent of the Manchester Guardian on August 21 last, that a resolution was moved in the conference to the effect that these agreements should and would be regarded as introductory to a policy of lowering world tariff barriers and that the resolution was opposed by the delegates of Canada? When a statement of that kind is made by a responsible correspondent in a very responsible journal, one of the ministers opposite should, in my opinion, either confirm or deny it.

My second objection to the agreement is this: That the Liberal policy in Canada has been and is today to base imperial preference upon a reduction of tariff rates. This is the first time in our Canadian history that we have had a wholesale increase of duties in order to grant greater preferences to the motherland.

My third objection—and I must hurry on—to this document is this; It disregards the opinion and conviction of every thinking economist and student of public affairs. All the leading economists of the world today, regardless of what country they belong to, place tariff revision downward in the front rank of remedial measures for the world's condition at the present time.

My fourth objection to this agreement is this: It will have its instant repercussion in further closing the doors of world markets for Canadian goods.

My fifth objection is this: the Prime Minister himself, in laying the agreement before us two weeks ago, declared that the agreements were based upon the Conservative policy of high protection, a policy to which I am unalterably, emphatically and unequivocally opposed at the present time and always. How soothing must it be to British pride, how soothing must it be to Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Bruce and the delegates from South Africa, New Zealand, India and Newfoundland when the Prime Minister of Canada rises in his place in parliament and in introducing these agreements to our consideration, informs us that they are