

United States for shipment to Great Britain. The answer—and I want my western friends to take heed of this—was this: "There is the law; these are the regulations." It was not for my right hon. friend to interpret them, he said. Why? Because the conditions under which our Canadian wheat may be consigned to Great Britain will be regulated not by the Prime Minister of Canada but by the old country, and there is nothing in the agreement to safeguard our western producers in regard to wheat consigned through a port in the United States.

I come now to another fatal, another tragic omission from this agreement. Have hon. members read carefully article 1 of the agreement between Canada and the motherland? They will find, if they will give it a relentless scrutiny, that there is in the first clause no guarantee for the Dominion of Canada of a preferential margin in regard to a single one of the items mentioned by the Prime Minister of Canada at page 117 of Hansard. What does that mean? It means that all this boasting and braggadocio about the superiority of the right hon. gentleman when it comes to bargaining results in disadvantage to this country, for the fact is that the old country delegates absolutely defeated him in this regard. What does Canada get? A mere shadow—

An hon. MEMBER: You don't believe it.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I will give the hon. gentleman the proof in a moment. Let me quote from an article that appeared in the *Montreal Star* on the 23rd day of September of the present year—an article inspired by hon. gentlemen in the administration of the Dominion of Canada. What does it say in regard to article 1:

The reports which have disturbed Ottawa statesmen—

I presume that refers to the administration. —are to the effect that the British government takes the view that except with regard to wheat, copper, fish, asbestos and a few more items in respect to which it definitely tied its hands it is free to extend to foreign countries the general free entry into the British market which the dominions now enjoy under the Import Duties Act.

Section 1 is then quoted, and the article proceeds:

The foregoing section just quoted simply binds the United Kingdom. They are said to be contending to continue free entry to the overseas dominions, not to restrict it to them alone. . . . Manifestly from the Canadian viewpoint a preference which the rest of the world could share is no preference at all. Its value would disappear the moment it was made general.

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

In conclusion, the article states:

It is contended that the dominions must continue to receive their present margin of preference over any arrangement which may be made unless the spirit, if not the bond, of the conference itself is to be violated.

I have reason to believe that this article was inspired by the present administration. And what is the conclusive proof that this government of Canada, at the conference, did not maintain for our Canadian exporters a preferential margin for our exports into the United Kingdom? Here is the proof. On the 21st day of October last the British government passed legislation with respect to these very items mentioned by the Prime Minister; and what did they do? They did not establish a maximum preference, as in some items, of 50 per cent, but a maximum rate of 33½ per cent, and for a period not of five years but of two years. That proves that within the four corners of this agreement there is no preferential margin; there is free entry but nothing to restrict the complete freedom of the British people to grant free entry to any nation in the world as well as to this dominion. Sir John Simon, the British Foreign Secretary, speaking four or five days ago in the British parliament, stated that there was nothing in the Ottawa agreement to restrict the freedom of the old country in reducing taxation so far as tariffs affecting other countries are concerned. This means that as regards this much-boasted free entry of our goods into the United Kingdom, a provision the significance of which, the Prime Minister tells us, it is impossible to over-estimate, really amounts to nothing. The right hon. gentleman has failed us, for the provision is not there; it is not to be found in the agreement. He has failed us, he has failed his own party, he has failed the people of Canada in this matter.

Being modest, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place on record categorically about fourteen objections I have to this vicious and iniquitous document. And may I say to the right hon. gentleman opposite that there is no one in Canada, there is no one in this parliament who would have greater pleasure this afternoon in standing up in this house and supporting these agreements than I should have, did they preserve the national integrity and fiscal autonomy of Canada, and were they conducive to the proper and free and unfettered development of the empire. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel the pull of a double loyalty. I had the thrilling emotion in a little village in the north western highlands on July 21 last, of listening, thousands of miles away, to the