

mitments of Canada to the United States are chiefly for the purpose of eliminating arbitrary executive interference with the normal course of trade. Abnormal situations can be fully met by our Anti-dumping Act.

As I have stated in the course of my remarks, the convention can be assailed from various angles. We have before us the offer of the late Government to negotiate on certain lines. If every item mentioned in its offer is examined in the light of what has now been secured, it will be found that we have fairly adhered to the line which the late Government was taking. It naturally was asking the maximum it could hope to attain, and was offering, perhaps, a little less than it expected to have to give. That is natural in all bargaining. When you are about to bargain with a foreign country you do not ask for less than you hope to get. The first months of the application of this treaty have not shown that Canada has the worse of the agreement. What will happen to-morrow or the day after, it is difficult to say. We must test the agreement by applying it. It is my hope that the two countries will find it mutually advantageous.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Honourable senators, the treaty which is sought to be ratified by this Bill may be a good treaty or a poor one. If it is a poor treaty it should be defeated; but, obviously, the place where it should be defeated is not this House, the second Chamber of our legislative organization. Throughout the history of our country we have always regarded matters of tariff and of taxation as subjects peculiarly within the determination of the direct and elected representatives of the people. Though we have asserted, and in my judgment have been undoubtedly within our legal right in asserting, that our power is unlimited with respect to all such matters, except as to their initiation, still we do not feel it at all appropriate that we should be a determining body as to any measure within these two spheres. Therefore I myself shall not vote against this Bill, and I shall not ask any others here who feel as I do about it to vote in the negative.

I want, though, to discuss the measure, because for all purposes it is wise that we understand it and come to some conclusions as to its likely result. So I shall endeavour to deal with it briefly this afternoon, at the same time admitting that the very short period within which I have been able to study the subject has not been sufficient to make me certain of my facts as to the manifold details of the treaty. In this connection

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

I ask that if I err at any point I be corrected by the honourable senator opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand), who, I know, has lived with this particular treaty much longer than I, and is more thoroughly familiar with its details.

We all, I believe, can cordially say we like the direction in which the treaty moves.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that the world, driven by intense nationalism, one of the products of the War, has tended to go much too far in the way of trade restrictions, and that we are disposed, all of us, to look with favour upon practical efforts to bring about reductions in tariffs, no matter between what countries arrangements may be made. Nor will I admit that this is not in every way consistent with the historic policy and tradition of the party with which, when in more active public life, I was associated.

I would add this. We have always felt that in respect of our trade relations with the United States it was necessary to exercise a greater degree of caution, to look farther into the future, than in respect of our trade relations with any other country. The reasons for that feeling are these. The United States is a mighty nation, in population more than twelve times the size of Canada. It is a nation which as a commercial organization is in every respect parallel to ours. It produces what we produce, it sells what we sell, and to a large extent it buys what we buy. But the proportion of Canada's trade affected by any reciprocal arrangement is of necessity enormously greater than the proportion of United States trade affected by the same arrangement. The impact of a treaty or of its denunciation upon us is relatively heavier, and the results which follow a disturbance of trade relations between the two countries are vastly more serious for Canada. The proportion of United States trade affected by such a dislocation is negligible, while in our case the proportion is immense and vital. For these reasons, and because of the history of our trade relations, we require to be especially careful as to the consequences and duration of any arrangement we make.

In the spirit of these axioms I approach a discussion of this treaty. The honourable senator who has just sat down proceeds upon the hypothesis that reciprocity with the United States is something sweet and beautiful and palatable to all on his side of the House, but invariably unpalatable and very ugly to all on this side. He assumes that reciprocity, no matter what may be the substance making up the actual facts to which that name is