

Hon. Mr. TANNER: My honourable friend might be glad to make such a treaty, he is so infatuated with those Washington agreements since 1854—that is a long time back—when we used to pay the farmer ten cents a pound for butter, fifteen cents for a bushel of potatoes, twenty cents for a barrel of turnips. Those were the golden days for our farmers. My honourable friend apparently would like to bring back those golden days by negotiating another reciprocity treaty.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Those are the prices that our farmers in Gaspé get to-day.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: We will let my honourable friend have all that satisfaction. But I would remind him that he is not in accord with his present leader at all, for in 1930 Mr. King—I presume he is still the leader of the Liberal Party—over his own signature publicly notified the United States that he was not going to try to negotiate any further reciprocity agreements with them, because they were not willing to make a fair arrangement. I think my honourable friend was assisting Mr. King in the general election of 1930 and must have read that formal public statement. I have no doubt that he supported his leader on that occasion; I have no doubt that he also supported the Dunning budget, which raised our tariff walls against the United States, and I have no doubt that he co-operated with the honourable leader on the other side of the House, who announced during that election that by the Dunning budget we were repaying the United States Government for their harsh treatment of us by taking \$200,000,000 worth of trade away from them. Did my honourable friend approve of that line of policy—high tariffs, refusing reciprocity, shutting ourselves off from the United States? I recall that throughout the election of 1930 he was one of the most diligent members of his party in supporting the very policy which now he tells us is all wrong. Now, can we place any confidence in a public man who is so inconsistent in his views? It is impossible. There must be some consistency in public life. That was only two years ago; but here is my honourable friend to-day born again! Why? Because he is in opposition now and would like to see Mr. King get back into office. There is the whole story. That is the kind of statesman that my honourable friend appears to be. I did not intend to make this digression, and if we are to go into our political history since 1854 it will take longer than the limited time that I have at my disposal this afternoon. However, I shall be very glad to discuss the matter fully with my honourable friend on some future occasion. I can assure him, from what I have

read and seen of his political career, that he will have a great deal of difficulty in keeping on a straight line.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I am a teetotaler.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Yesterday my honourable friend from Sydney (Hon. Mr. McLennan) mentioned the subject of the St. Lawrence Waterway. I am not going to discuss it at the moment, but I agree with him that it is a great and important subject which we should all be considering and studying. I can say that the report of the Senate Committee of 1928, to which he referred, contains an enormous amount of useful information on the St. Lawrence Waterway—information which in many respects cannot be found in any other available publication. I second his recommendation that honourable members of this House and the public in general should devote considerable of their time to a thorough study of the subject.

I would point out one or two facts in addition to those stated by my honourable friend. We are apt to think of the St. Lawrence as if it were wholly a Canadian river. It is true we are fortunately situated in having all that part of the St. Lawrence from Lake St. Francis out to the Gulf in Canadian territory. But I desire to put on record a fact which we should not overlook. Of the 1,215 miles of lake and river navigation courses down to Montreal there are on the United States side of the boundary line 675 miles, only 477 miles on the Canadian side, and only 63 miles on the boundary line itself. I point this out in order to let the House and the country know that while we have sovereignty, yet there is the boundary line winding down through these lakes and through the river, and on this side and on that the respective proportions of navigable water which I have mentioned. It will also be found by consulting the report that a great deal of work has been done by the United States Government, not only on its own side of the boundary line, but also on the Canadian side, with our consent. On this work it has expended very large sums of money. At Sault Ste. Marie it will be found that the great bulk of our freight goes through the United States canal, because it is of greater capacity than the Canadian canal. That is all I desire to say on the subject at this time, merely to put honourable members on inquiry so they may study the subject.

We have heard a good deal this afternoon about unemployment. Nobody will belittle the question; undoubtedly it is of grave importance. We have been asked by my honourable friend from Rougemont (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) what the Ottawa Government is