

the same paper the manager of the fishing business at Prince Rupert came out and said that already the good effects of the treaty were being felt and that the price of fish in Prince Rupert had risen higher than the price of fish in the United States.

Mr. HANSON: (Skeena): The lowest price in the history of the Pacific coast is now being paid for fish in Prince Rupert.

Mr. ESLING: If the hon. gentleman will read his own Prince Rupert paper of October 28, he will see there the statement of the manager of the canning plant, or whatever it is, who says that he is delighted with the condition of the market at Prince Rupert and takes exception to the statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre. He also states that the price of fish is higher in Prince Rupert today than in the United States. The same paper also mentions the statements made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in regard to lumber. The lumbermen of Vancouver seem to be satisfied with the effects of the treaty so far as lumber is concerned, and they commend this government for making the agreement. The fact seems to be that hon. gentlemen opposite are simply prejudiced against anything that is going to promote the welfare and progress of this dominion in these times of stress, just because the measures emanate from a Conservative government. We may not see the good effects of this agreement within the next year or so, but they are sure to come, and hon. gentlemen opposite will then have the opportunity to tell their constituents that they simply made a mistake in voting against this agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say that nothing could better illustrate the endeavour of hon. gentlemen opposite to misrepresent those on this side of the house than the speech to which we have just listened. Over and over again the hon. member for West Kootenay said that certain members on this side had opposed this agreement because of this particular portion of it. May I say to him at once that no hon. member on this side is opposed to this particular portion. If he was, he would have so stated long before the imperial conference ever took place because these British duties according a preference to the dominion were not put on at the recent imperial conference but were put on by the British government many months before the conference ever took place. This schedule relates to timber, fish, salmon, other fish, canned, asbestos, zinc and lead, and on

every one of these particular articles mentioned the British government at the time it introduced its tariff gave a ten per cent preference to the dominions, and the rate which is given under this agreement is ten per cent. So the British government have simply continued the same rate of preference. Is it conceivable that at the recent conference the government of Canada would have asked Great Britain to do away with the preference which she had given months before the conference was ever held? What we are opposing in so far as it touches this matter at all are the representations of hon. gentlemen opposite that what has been secured in the treaty in this particular is due to some effort of theirs. It is not due to some effort of theirs. It is just another example of the same thing that took place this afternoon in connection with the bill the Minister of National Revenue was concerned with. We have to thank the British government, not our own government, for what there is of advantage to Canada in this part of the agreement, because what is here set forth was granted before our own government had anything to do with the conference at all.

May I add a further point? Probably hon. members will say: Oh yes, but we have persuaded Great Britain to keep these preferences on, and to remove them only upon the consent of the government of Canada. On Friday evening I touched on that feature. In so far as that contention has any significance at all it constitutes interference by one government with the affairs of another, and similar interference at the instance of the British parliament or government we would not stand for for one minute. If in Great Britain they wish to make their agreements subject to conditions of that kind it is their own business, but it is not a precedent that we are going to follow. May I add that the Secretary of the Treasury in Great Britain made a specific statement in the British house that so far as the British parliament was concerned, it would not regard itself bound by these duties any longer than the parliament of Great Britain wished to have themselves so bound. Over and over again it has been stated by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this house that the British government is perfectly free to change these duties at any time they like except in so far as they may regard themselves as in honour bound. But they are not in any way legally or constitutionally bound.