

about the United States. I do not say that he harbours such sentiments, but in 1891 and in 1911, I think, he joined in the hue and cry of those who said, "No truck nor trade with the Yankees." I may tell him this: The agreements that we shall pass may be of some value for the present time, but in my judgment they do not make for the peace of the world, because they are based on a very materialistic and narrow principle. We all know that the statesmen of the world to-day are praying for the lowering of tariff barriers in order to create new channels of trade and exchange between the war-stricken peoples of the world. We know that high tariffs pave the way to war, not to peace.

Some day a new administration will come into office at Washington. Nobody believes, I suppose, that Mr. Hoover will be the next President of the United States. I am far from having anything against Mr. Hoover; he is a good Quaker and therefore a peaceful man; but no President of the United States has ever passed through the crucible that Mr. Hoover has passed through and emerged triumphant at the polls. The State of Maine the other day gave a warning to the powers that be in Washington that the Democratic candidate, a gentleman who bears the great and noble name of an ancient family, will, as surely as I see His Honour the Speaker in the Chair, be the next President. Mr. Roosevelt is outspoken. The other day, in the State of Massachusetts, he delivered a speech the text of which I have upstairs—I am sorry I have not brought it here—in which he plainly said that one of the causes of the distress in the United States, where there are to-day eleven million unemployed, was their tariff, which, he said, was as high as Haman's gallows. He said that when the Democrats take office they will change that tariff, and that they will deal fairly, especially with their neighbours and best customers, the Canadians. "I will not hesitate," he said, "to enter into negotiations with Canada." Never, honourable gentlemen, since the days of Mr. Taft and Mr. Wilson, has a public man in the United States spoken so plainly regarding the relations that should exist between the two great nations of the North American continent.

I feel very strongly on this matter, because I believe that we are, as we say in French, *cherchant midi à quatorze heures*. We are looking only to Great Britain, which affords us an excellent market. Under the preference given to Great Britain by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the late Mr. Fielding, without the exaction of any return, Canada prospered. My right honourable friend (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) was

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX.

then a budding young lawyer in the West, and he knows that from the moment the preference of 1897 was granted the British consumer looked towards Canada and began buying butter, cheese, fruits, hay, grain and timber from this country. You will not develop trade by exacting preferences from the other fellow to the same extent that you are willing to grant them to him. The broader you are in your dealings with the other fellow, the more broadly you will be treated by him.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the honourable gentleman permit a question?

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Would he favour exacting anything from the United States in the case of a treaty of reciprocity with that country?

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Or would he think of leaving it to them to say what they would do?

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, no. I would do what Sir John A. Macdonald did. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854-66 continued, after its abolition, to agitate public opinion in the United States and in this country. Sir John A. Macdonald realized what the people felt and until 1879 he was in favour of the renewal of the treaty. I was not then twenty-one, but I could understand politics. I remember that when he introduced his resolutions for the National Policy in 1879 he made—

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: A standing offer.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: —a standing offer of reciprocity covering exactly the same articles of the old Reciprocity Treaty. My right honourable friend has only to look at the Statutes of 1879 to find the truth of what I am saying. That offer remained on the Statute Book for many years.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: My honourable friend has missed my point. I understood him to argue in favour of a bargaining treaty with the United States, such as was made by his Government in 1911.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I was speaking of England.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The question is: why is it perfectly safe to make such a treaty with the United States, but a very dangerous thing to make one with England?