

I see that Article 7 says:

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom will invite Parliament to pass legislation which will secure for a period of ten years from the date hereof to tobacco, consigned from any part of the British Empire and grown, produced or manufactured in Canada, the existing margin of preference over foreign tobacco, so long, however, as the duty on foreign unmanufactured tobacco does not fall below 2/0 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb., in which event the margin of preference shall be equal to the full duty.

The article provides for legislation covering ten years, but the convention is for five years. I cannot reconcile the termination of the convention with the retention of Article 7. Perhaps my right honourable friend will explain what appears to be an anomaly or a contradiction.

It seems to me that in the application of those agreements there is no equality of treatment in London and in Ottawa. Are we not independent units, equal to one another and entitled to equal and fair treatment?

What effect will these agreements have when we meet the outside world in the Economic Conference shortly to be held in London? Will they stand as an example to the outside world, as some assert, or will they be an impediment, as others contend? Although I have gone through the treaty agreements but hastily since they came into my hands last night, I notice that there are increases in duties which will stand before the World Conference, and which may be deemed to be impediments in the way of a general tariff reduction. We must not forget that at the World Conference of 1927 there was a unanimous resolution in favour of reduced tariffs. Even our good friends on the other side of the line joined in that resolution, though lately, I hear, Mr. Hoover, the outgoing President, has stood for higher tariffs and promised the electors, more especially in the agricultural communities, still higher tariffs on some commodities.

I think the Right Hon. the Prime Minister will find that economic nationalism will not be regarded as restoring prosperity throughout the world. Under it our transportation by land and sea has broken down. The best excuse that has been formulated for a high tariff is that it can be used as a negotiating instrument. If so, it would be, at best, but a transitory or provisional argument. I hope that by means of the instrument forged by the present Government it will be possible to obtain throughout the world such advantages as will help to make that instrument unnecessary, because a high tariff, while it stands, is a great hindrance to the farming com-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

munity. Equilibrium must be established between farm products and industrial products, for only then will the purchasing power of the farming community be restored. During the late days of last session, I think, I stated that the Archbishop of Montreal in a very important pronouncement had said that the farmer alone should not bear the burden, and that if high wages were the cause of the high cost of production those engaged in industry should bear their portion of the load.

The railway problem will be before us when the Government's policy on the subject is known. Whether or not the legislation will follow closely the terms of the report of the Royal Commission or embody its conclusions I cannot say, but it will be interesting to see the result of the Government's cogitations on this matter.

As to the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty, if the Senate of Canada awaits the pleasure of the Senate of the United States before acting, and the United States Senate runs true to form, it will be some years before a conclusion is reached.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Honourable members, all of us in this House are proud of the long service and fascinating personality of the honourable senator from Acadie (Hon. Mr. Poirier), and the fact that he was chosen to perform the duty of moving the Address at this session, and that he accepted, has given us a pleasure which has been added to by the manner in which he performed that duty. The honourable senator from Richmond—West Cape Breton (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) is new among us, being the youngest member of this House until to-day, and in following the oldest member of this House he has well and truly performed the task of seconding the motion for an Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I extend my congratulations to both of them, but to the honourable senator from Acadie I do so with the deference of a novice to a professional.

I have listened with very keen interest and great care to the speech delivered by the honourable leader of the other side of the House. The debate on the Address is, or ought to be, the first great inquest of the nation's representatives into its affairs. Certainly it should be made such by this House, and should be conducted just as earnestly and as thoroughly and universally—if the word is not too strong—as in the Lower House. There is no way in which we can perform our duties better than by making this the occasion of a searching enquiry, and we ought to seek to conduct that enquiry with the business-like efficiency of which we think we are en-