

they hoped to have; while we on our side considerably improved our position in the British market. It is recognized that no trade agreement can be arrived at without mutual concessions, and I am under the impression that in Great Britain as well as in Canada the agreement generally has been well received. It has been in operation since the budget speech was delivered, and I have yet to hear of any dissatisfaction with its operation.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Honourable senators, I have always been a profound admirer of what are known now as the Ottawa agreements. I can say that with all the more emphasis because, although a member of the Government, I had absolutely nothing to do with their negotiation myself. They are, in my judgment, the best achievement for this Dominion that has been effected for many a decade.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The achievement of 1932 was a tremendous thing. It was the great starting point of recovery from the depression. I do not want to modify my language a whit in expressing true and earnest appreciation of the great thing that was done at that time. Besides being great in itself, it inaugurated a policy of mutual preference. It adopted and embedded in our system a new principle, and it has contributed tremendously not only to the rehabilitation of trade within the Empire, but to the strength of the bonds of the Empire itself.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Now, even though at this time we did not feel friendly to the variations made in the treaty and embedded in the arrangement before us for approval, this House would certainly be very chary about defeating the measure. Certainly we would not amend it. But the variations are not such as even to challenge our contention. The Bill is a sufficiently faithful photograph of the measure of 1932 to warrant everyone in this House, of whatever party, supporting it. There are a few chiselings here and there. There is just a little touching up around the eyes and the mouth, but if you stand six feet away you cannot tell this measure from the one passed in 1932; and we approve it with all the more alacrity because we stand in the shadow of what might have been. For four years we stood and shivered under the threat of cancellation of treaties, of a new Government wiping them off the slate. Having escaped that fate, we are rejoiced at having them revived in this form, and are almost inclined to praise the

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

changes, though on the merits I do not think they are an improvement at all. I thoroughly support the measure, and would have supported it had I been in the other House, but in essence it is nothing more than Parliament's approval—four years after—of what was done in 1932.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I do not intend to lessen in the slightest the pleasure of my right honourable friend in reviewing this measure. I simply desire to say that, commendable as was the action of the Government of which my right honourable friend was an ornament—

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Purely an ornament?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: In this instance, yes; for the right honourable gentleman himself declared that he had taken no part in the making of the convention.

I desire to remind him of the fact that it was Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding who first placed on the Statute Book a preference for British goods—to the tune of 33½ per cent—and that all parties had to await the day when the British Parliament would decide to impose duties on foreign goods. It was only after that action had been taken that the Government of Canada was enabled to say: "We have waited all the years from 1897 until now; we have given you a liberal preference; it is time for you to show some appreciation of our action." I mention this simply to show that since 1897 there has been no difference of opinion in Canada as to the advantage that would accrue if Great Britain could give us a preference.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did my honourable friend's friends vote against the agreements?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I shall not go into the detail of the reasons why the matter was opposed. I only recall the fact that there have been two trends of thought in Canada, two policies since, I would say, 1878—high duties and lower duties. I have often affirmed that there was no free trade party in Canada. After the Conservative party had declared itself in favour of high protection there was a fair tariff or fair trade policy party. I remember that we went to the people—I think in 1908—with Sir Robert Borden's delightful expression "adequate protection" ringing in our ears—an expression which did not bind him to a high tariff at all. We have been discussing tariffs for a number of years, and I can quite conceive that the suggestion of Mr. Baldwin at the opening of the conference in Ottawa would have been met by the liberal