

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: The request goes to the Sergeant-at-Arms, generally through the Speaker. A lady who wants to have a party will call up the Speaker, who will refer her to the Sergeant-at-Arms. He may tell her, "We cannot give you lunch to-day," but she will say, "I am going to have a luncheon to-day and invitations have already been issued for it," and she will insist upon her point.

Another practice which has become common is that of members writing a note saying, "I want you to serve lunch for six lady friends of mine." These ladies then come to the restaurant, although the member does not accompany them. Only yesterday six employees were sent up with a letter, and while they were being served members of the Senate and of the House of Commons remained standing at the door waiting for an opportunity to get in to have their lunch. One ex-minister has told me that he would like to lunch at the restaurant, but that he could go down town or to his club and get his lunch more quickly than he could get it in the Parliamentary Restaurant.

This is a condition which will have to be remedied. As you know, the Restaurant Committee usually meets only towards the end of the session, for the purpose of dealing with accounts, but I shall endeavour to see the Speaker of the House of Commons and get him to call a meeting of the committee, so that the whole question may be considered. I trust that a satisfactory solution of the difficulty will be reached.

Hon. Mr. MULLINS: Honourable senators, I have been a member of the Restaurant Committee since 1930. The statements that have been made about deficits are wrong. There is no deficit; there is a credit balance. Yesterday I asked about all the functions that were going on, what all the ladies were doing there, and whether the business was bringing in a revenue to the restaurant. I was assured that it was. However, I shall go further into the matter, for I feel a certain responsibility. In the past I have made efforts to bring the restaurant up to a high standard. I took the young man who was doing the purchasing down to the packing plant and showed him the types of meat he should put in. I want to see the restaurant kept up to standard, and I do not like to hear it criticized.

I am sorry that I could not hear what honourable members were saying. I wish they would speak up. They have got into the habit of whispering. When they mumble their words I cannot hear them, and I feel

Hon. Mr. McMEANS.

very lonely. If they continue they will have me going back to the House of Commons next election.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: Oh, no.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Oh, oh.

PRIVATE BILL

THIRD READING

Bill A, an Act to incorporate the Economical Mutual Fire Insurance Company.
—Right Hon. Mr. Graham.

CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT BILL

MOTION FOR SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill 13, an Act respecting a certain Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States of America.

Hon. F. B. BLACK: Honourable senators, I have but few remarks to make upon this trade agreement. I may begin by saying that I would rather call it a trade agreement, not reciprocity, because it is not reciprocity in the proper sense.

In introducing this Bill yesterday the honourable leader of the House referred to the prosperity which Canada enjoyed under the Reciprocity Treaty which was in effect from 1854 to 1866. That was before my time, but I have heard of it. During that period times were good for two reasons, the primary reason being the one referred to yesterday by the honourable gentleman, namely, the war between the North and the South, which gave us a market across the line which otherwise we could never have had—a market which was closed to us as soon as the war was over.

I believe that a certain measure of trade between nations is good, and I am quite in accord with those who say that tariff walls have been raised entirely too high. We, however, are too small to exert an economic influence on the whole world. The best illustration of the truth of this statement is the fact that the greatest exemplar of free trade in modern times, Great Britain, had to adopt a protective policy when Germany built up her foreign trade and took away 40 per cent of what had been Great Britain's, France did likewise and took away 17 per cent, and the United States adopted the highest tariff of any country in the world. It is under that protective policy, a policy of very high protection, that Great Britain