

Though I do not like to assume the rôle of prophet, even in the most humble degree, I must say that I shall not be very much surprised if this treaty has a rather short and sorrowful existence. In fact I see signs of a dying struggle commencing already. One of the fifty per cent reductions we do get under this treaty is on distilled liquors. By reason of policies in vogue in Canada for decades gone by, we have tremendous quantities of unused, cured, thoroughly seasoned liquors, the value of which runs into scores of millions, and it is well worth while trying to arrange a market for these in the country to the south, if we can do it. This treaty does contain an item with respect to distilled liquors, but I wish the honourable senator who has just sat down had told us some of the inside facts about what is taking place to-day. He knows them. He knows that responsible officials of that country have made regulations which when operative—and they are all but in effect now—will just wipe out that whole advantage.

One of those regulations stipulates that any citizens of this country who are to benefit by that phase of the treaty, instead of submitting their conduct in Canada to the jurisdiction of our own courts, must submit it to the jurisdiction of United States courts. Why did the honourable senator not tell us where his Government stands on that? Is it going to yield? And if it does not yield, what will be the consequences? It is likely, at all events there is a danger, that our first experience in respect of this measure will be the very same sort of experience we had in respect of free wheat and flour.

The honourable senator says, "In making this treaty we followed the plan suggested by the late Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Mr. Bennett. He made an offer, and we have concluded a treaty along the same lines. Therefore you should not complain about it. Your mouths are closed, because you were ready to do the same thing." I put one question to him. He said Mr. Bennett offered to give the intermediate tariff and most-favoured-nation treatment to the United States in return for certain things. All he read was this—I do not know how much more there was; I have not the letter before me—that it was to be in return for the exercise by the President of the power to reduce by fifty per cent the duties on certain natural products of Canada; *inter alia*, merely by way of example, on four or five classes of goods. They were: lumber, fish, potatoes, milk and cream, and live cattle. I asked him if the consideration had been obtained even in respect of those few sug-

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

gested classes named in Mr. Bennett's proposal, and he said, "Partly." That is to say, we got a part of what was to be our share of the bargain if Mr. Bennett's offer had gone through. I tell my honourable friend we did not get that share in respect of a single one of those four or five classes. We came nearest to getting it in relation to lumber. There is no denying that we derive advantages with respect to lumber, but we do not get what was stipulated for by Mr. Bennett. On some classifications of lumber there is to be a reduction of fifty per cent in duty, but this is accompanied by a new provision, something which was not required before, that our exports must not exceed a certain amount in one year. So I repeat that with respect to lumber we are not obtaining the consideration for which Mr. Bennett stipulated.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: British Columbia seems very happy.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: British Columbia gets benefits in respect of lumber, no doubt, but I am arguing as to whether we got what Mr. Bennett stipulated. We did not. The honourable gentleman's leader went to Washington and soon convinced the occupant of the White House that he was ready to sign anything, and in a very short time he came back with a treaty. The Government feels that because it can write the appellation "reciprocity" across it, the treaty must be good. I cannot congratulate the honourable senator, nor can I congratulate his leader on being a master of trade agreements. I do not think he has made a single successful trade agreement in his political career. There are things at which he is good, but trade agreements are not included among them.

Now, in respect to fish, I should like to appeal to honourable senators from either coast, British Columbia or the Maritimes. Have we got very much benefit here in respect to fish?

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton): No.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: There is something of value to British Columbia: there is a reduction in the rates on halibut, which would be beneficial to that province. But I venture to say there is not a representative of any fish-producing province in Canada who will assert that the treaty contains anything of real value to the fishing industry of the Maritime Provinces. Is there a reduction of fifty per cent in the duty on cod shipped into the United States? That would be something worth while, but it is not there. There is nothing about coal at all.