

established under tariffs which are made binding for a period of five years? Is not a subsequent parliament bound by what is being done now with respect to all the changes that may be made in the tariff structure of this country either here by this parliament or in Britain by the British parliament? On April 26, 1928, my right hon. friend said, as reported at page 2399 of Hansard:

This particular bill is, I think, the one in which we endeavoured to apply, as something that should be observed generally in matters of this kind, the principle to which reference has been made. Personally I have held a very strong view for some considerable time as to the undesirability of any legislature or parliament tying the hands of succeeding legislatures or parliaments with respect to annual expenditures. That idea may or may not be sound, but I do not think that when matters of policy are affected—and matters of policy always are affected in relation to grants of public moneys—this parliament should tie the hands of two or three succeeding parliaments. Not denying that parliament has always the right to repeal legislation, I submit that it is undesirable to create vested rights with respect to legislation;

Nothing could be more emphatic than that. The Prime Minister made it very clear that it is fundamentally wrong for one parliament to attempt to bind subsequent parliaments, but yet we are going to be bound. That will be the effect of these agreements; although we have not seen them, we are bound already by them. How then can we say that this parliament has had reserved to it its full fiscal autonomy and its full independence in dealing with fiscal matters?

When the agreements are brought down I shall have something more to say, but may I indicate now that we on this side will view them from the point of view of their effect upon domestic conditions in Canada; we will view them from the point of view of inter-imperial relations and organization and from the point of view of international relations and organization. As I have said, if they will make for more in the way of trade without circumscribing our freedom, they will have our wholehearted support.

When it comes to inter-imperial relations, utterances of the Prime Minister already made would seem to indicate that under this arrangement we are not so much freeing trade within the empire as making increasingly difficult trade between different parts of the empire and the world. I want to make it quite plain immediately that what Canada wants and needs is world markets and that any agreements which will foster trade within the empire at the expense of freedom of trade with other countries will not be acceptable to the country or as we would wish to have

them. My right hon. friend is reported in the *Calgary Herald* of September 6, 1932, as follows:

He did not believe that the results of the Imperial conference had yet been fully realized or would be for some time. One thing was certain, however, that nations outside of the empire would be asked to pay some tribute for the privilege of trading within the empire.

If as a result of the agreements which have been reached all other countries have to pay some tribute before they will be permitted to trade with any part of the empire, then I say a very serious situation is being created. In other words, if the purpose of these agreements is to create something in the nature of an economic unit, as we have heard it described over and over again, there can be only one result, and that is that economic units of vast proportions will grow up in other parts of the world, and it will become increasingly difficult for Canada to find outside of the British Empire itself any markets for her surplus products, products too large and too great in extent to find sufficient markets within the empire.

I might mention other things, as for example the price—shall I use that term?—which under these agreements Great Britain may have to pay for the right to send some of her commodities to this country. Are we to understand that the tariff has been lowered in some respects only on the condition that the tariff will be raised in Great Britain? That is something which we will have to examine with a good deal of care. If that is the case it means that the government of Canada has virtually compelled the British government to tax the food of the British people. Is that the price of the arrangement whereby the duties are to be lowered in this country to whatever extent they may be lowered? Since when has it become part of the policy of Canada to compel another part of the British Empire to tax its food? I have always understood that the last thing the farmers of this country desired was to compel a tax to be placed upon the food of the peoples in any other part of the world. They do not wish to see the taxes on food put up in other parts of the world any more than they wish to see taxes put up in Canada on the things they need to buy; what they want to see, speaking broadly, is taxation taken off food and everything else. Speaking generally that is their point of view—it is in the direction of freeing the world from the restrictions of trade rather than of increasing those restrictions. We will want to know whether there has been a price which makes it more difficult