

It may interest some of you to know that they have copied almost in their entirety some of the provisions which hon. gentlemen opposite condemned so loudly. They have copied measures that were submitted to this house because they believed that through the use of them they could best accomplish that which they desired.

Mr. YOUNG: The power of an evil example.

Mr. BENNETT: It may be the power of an evil example, as the hon. member for Weyburn has suggested, but we prefer to think it is the power of a realization of what necessity commands people to do in the interests of their own country.

One step further. The right hon. gentleman referred also to the wheat quota, which is connected with this transaction, and he read from the opening observations I made at the plenary conference. He did not however read from my closing observations. I said that in the interim the quota system had been suggested and the British government was not prepared to follow it at that time to its end. They suggested it, first of all, for domestic purposes; the extension of it to the dominions was another matter altogether. In the end what happened was that the quota was being further explored and finally after the election it was concluded that it might be used for domestic purposes, and later might be made applicable to the dominions. The right hon. gentleman is very anxious to tell the people of the west that if this quota was good it was deplorable that they did not have it during the last twelve months. Well, he was in power nine years; why did he not get it then? The real fact of the matter is that the quota was being explored, and is still being explored. When we left London the economic committee was not prepared to make a recommendation; the quota principle had not been sufficiently explored to enable them to speak with certainty with respect to its results. I say now as I said at the close of the conference, if anyone is interested in reading what I said—and I know some of you are not—we have not sufficient evidence to enable us to speak with any certainty with regard to the matter.

Now, there are many other subjects dealt with in the speech from the throne to which reference has been made this afternoon, but I do not propose to prolong this debate for the purpose of covering them again. With respect to the St. Lawrence waterway, I have this to say, that I believe the proper course to pursue in the matter is by verbal negotiations and discussions. If a treaty is concluded

[Mr. Bennett.]

—of course the very word "treaty" implies that the agreement is between sovereign nations, or communities that speak as sovereign nations—then it is submitted to parliament for approval. If a treaty is to be the subject of discussion in parliament before it is signed, obviously it is not a treaty. Everyone knows that in international dealings after a bargain is made each government instructs its plenipotentiary to sign the instrument constituting the treaty, and the treaty is then submitted for the consideration of parliament. But at no time in the history of this country or of Great Britain has a document been submitted to parliament and been called a treaty unless it was an executed instrument. If it is a bad instrument, then of course, it will be rejected by parliament. Was the Halibut treaty signed or was it not? Was the treaty with respect to salmon signed or was it not? You cannot endeavour to escape responsibilities in that way; you cannot escape your constitutional obligations. I should just like to make this simple observation. We are not hurrying the St. Lawrence waterway treaty. All you have to do is look at the map and see your completed Welland canal and your twenty-seven foot waterway to Albany, and then you know why the Canadian government is concerned about the matter. When the appropriate time comes I fancy Canadians will realize that the reason why this government is now carrying on negotiations for the completion of that waterway is not that we desire to add one more to the burdens we have, but that the development we have reached in connection with our own canal system and the canal systems of our great neighbour to the south makes it essential that now, and at no other time, we should consider it. It is all so easy and simple to condemn governments because they take action. Did it ever occur to hon. members that there are occasions in the lives of nations as of individuals when decisions have to be made or the opportunity is gone for ever? That is the situation here. At the appropriate time if a treaty is concluded this house of course will have the fullest opportunity to discuss it and, if it so desires, to reject it. Because the treaty is not being made in any party sense; if made at all it is a treaty made by the Canadian government on behalf of the Canadian people, and if the representatives of the Canadian people believe it to be a bad treaty, they will do what one would expect them to do, namely, reject it.

So far as the disarmament conference is concerned, so much has been said that I will not repeat the language of the speech from