

moment when I was expressing, as I think hon. gentlemen will agree, in a kindly and straightforward manner, my appreciation of one of the appointments which the Prime Minister had made of a former colleague to be the leader of the Senate; when I had been speaking, as I say, surely in a courteous way, my right hon. friend interrupted to say, to all intents and purposes, that the appointment which he had made had been made in order that he might have in the Senate, in the person of the new leader of the Senate, an instrument of his will, someone who on his behalf is to perform the office of Lord High Executioner, someone who, without any evidence, without any hearing, is to be prosecutor, jury, judge, pronounce the verdict and the sentence, and complete the entire indictment and legal process, all on his own authority. May I say to my right hon. friend I think he is very much mistaken if he imagines the present leader of the Senate is going to be simply an instrument of his will in matters of that kind. He will find the double-barrelled arrangement will not work quite as smoothly as he believes will be the case in this particular instance. But, *asides* apart, I would say that the Prime Minister of Canada, who is not only the leader of the House of Commons, but, above all others, supposed to be the guardian of the rights and privileges of parliament, should be the last one to set an example which he himself knows to be entirely wrong.

I now proceed to the other matters that are mentioned in the speech from the throne. There are in it some subjects of general interest. It is not indicated that any of them are to be followed by legislation, but it is to be presumed that in the course of the session legislation will be introduced with respect to some of them. I shall take them up pretty much in the order in which they appear in the speech from the throne. One is:

My ministers have under consideration a commercial treaty with the Dominion of New Zealand.

I wish the government had found it possible to tell us that a commercial treaty had been arrived at which would be presented to parliament. That is what we had understood from the press. It is quite right, however, that the ministry should safeguard its statements, and all we know at the moment is that it has under consideration a treaty with New Zealand.

The thought that comes to my mind is this: If it has been possible within the past few weeks to arrive at a treaty with New

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Zealand which contains any advantages to both countries, why was that not possible a year ago? Why have we not had the advantages that would flow from such a treaty during the past year when anything in the way of additional trade would have meant a great deal to Canada? Nearly a year ago, the Prime Minister of New Zealand was here in the city of Ottawa, ready to negotiate. He was prepared to sit down with the Canadian ministry and formulate a treaty, but hon. gentlemen opposite were not willing or ready to discuss a treaty with him. When the Hon. Mr. Forbes realized their attitude he went back to New Zealand and made a public statement to his own parliament. In this connection, I read from a Canadian press cable from Wellington, New Zealand, dated June 4, as it appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of June 5, 1931:

The Prime Minister said he hoped Canada would agree to send her minister of trade to New Zealand to negotiate a new trade treaty. New Zealand has been forced to show a strong hand—in placing Canadian imports on the general tariff scale—in view of Canada's "complete failure to listen to representations regarding the butter duty," he said.

Those words are in quotations. Then, the article continues:

Mr. Forbes added that on the day he had arrived in Ottawa, Canada had taken an unfriendly action by raising the butter duty. "Canada slammed the door in New Zealand's face at the very time when she was anxious to negotiate," the Prime Minister said.

Those words are in quotations—"slammed the door in New Zealand's face". Canada slammed the door in New Zealand's face—that may be a part of the process of blasting a way into the markets of the world. Let us hope however that there will be no more slamming of doors between different parts of the empire. If that is to be the method of procedure at the forthcoming imperial conference I can tell my right hon. friend he will not get very far in any trade negotiations he may have with any part of the empire. Let him take a lesson from what has been the experience with regard to New Zealand and adopt a different method of negotiating with different parts of the empire in matters of common interest. We will hope that the treaty said to be under consideration is one which will prove beneficial to both Canada and New Zealand, and that its provisions will be laid before the house at a very early date.

The speech from the throne contains reference to two conferences. I shall refer first to the paragraph on the Disarmament conference. It reads: