

I will tell my honourable friend something which is in the treaty: there is a reduction from two cents to one cent in the duty on halibut shipped from the United States into Canada. I do not think there were any considerable imports when the duty was two cents a pound, but I am not so confident there will be none under this lower duty.

In respect of fish there is little of value to Canada. There is something, but it is not fifty per cent anywhere, and it applies only to one section of our country.

Now we come to fruit. Do we get the fifty per cent reduction which the President himself has power to implement in respect of fruits sent from Canada to the United States? We do not. I do not think we get it anywhere. I am not sure whether we get it on cherries, and if not, we do not get it anywhere. We get from 25 to 15 cents on apples. Is that any good? In forty-one of the forty-seven states of the American Union apples are grown in commercial quantities—practically every variety of apple we can grow. Can we ship across the line apples matured later than theirs, against a duty of 15 cents?

Now, what do we give them? We make very serious concessions in respect of fruit. I do not know that they are so serious if the Government maintains the policy of the late Administration as regards valuation, but if it does not they are very serious. What was that policy? It was a policy built upon section 43, I think it is, which enables the Minister of Inland Revenue, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to fix valuations on fruit and to vary them one season as against another. We all remember how that so-called "vicious" section was reviled by our friends opposite, throughout this Dominion. The wounding finger of scorn was pointed at it on every platform. It was heralded as the great example of autocracy and denial of democratic rights which characterized the late Administration. It was pictured as the very insignia of autocracy itself, and thundered against on every platform. I tell the honourable member that unless the section is maintained in virtually its full effect, he has made disastrous concessions in respect of fruit. I am not very much afraid that the Government will not maintain the section. They are very different men in office from what they are out of office.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Most persons are.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The right honourable member ought to know; he has been both in and out.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Several times.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: We have here the finest illustration of political consistency I have ever seen in my political life. This clause, reviled by one and all of our friends opposite, damned in their press from end to end of Canada, is specifically preserved in every schedule of the fruit list; and they say it may be exercised to the extent of 80 per cent of its average height in any year back, I think, to 1931. Valuations for duty purposes may be raised so long as they do not exceed 80 per cent of the average as fixed under this heinous clause. So all my honourable friends really meant in that campaign of revilement and abuse was that our conduct in fixing valuations was all right if we had only fixed them as high as 80 per cent. What I would advise honourable members opposite to do in this regard is just to follow in the footsteps of the late Government with the utmost punctiliousness. If they do they will not get very far wrong. They can follow up only to 80 per cent under this legislation, but that is closer than they are going to get in any other respect. They will be 80 per cent right anyway. I would warn them not to delay the imposition of what they call "artificial valuations," which they have undertaken to preserve. Let them not defer until United States fruit is coming in. Those valuations should be imposed at least four weeks before our fruit matures. If they do not follow in the footsteps of the late Administration to that extent, then by this treaty they will have dealt a disastrous blow to our fruit industry.

We have given a great deal. We have not got from the United States very much in return. They were exceedingly frugal in their concessions. I do not know that it is an argument against a treaty to say that we have given more than we have got. The only argument which would prevail with me would be an argument showing that the balance of value is on the right side for us. Although the balance of value might be greater for them than for us, this would not necessarily imply that the treaty is not good. If the gain to us is greater than our loss, then of course the treaty is good for Canada.

The honourable member says time will tell whether the treaty is good or bad. I am happy that time is to be allowed to tell. I am happy there are to be three years in which we may measure the wisdom and expectations of honourable gentlemen opposite. I am glad this agreement will not be defeated. I am glad they will have no opportunity to shed salt tears and lament its defeat. I am glad the agreement is to be measured by the sure guide of results and fruits.