

The Liberals have been asked to accept these agreements in the proper spirit. I would like to remind hon. members of the manner in which these agreements were presented to the house. First we were told that the policy of high protection was the policy enunciated by the Conservative party prior to the election of 1930. Then we were informed in no uncertain terms that at the conference of 1930 the high protection policies of the Conservative party were advanced by the present government. The right hon. Prime Minister further stated: "We have succeeded where the Liberals have failed"; and again, "we"—with the emphasis on the "we"—"have done well." Such language, Mr. Speaker, I claim is partisan and not conducive to national spirit.

There have been many references on the part of hon. members to loyalty to the empire. I think that kind of talk should be eliminated. I do not believe any hon. member should accuse any one person or party of having more loyalty or less, than another because each of us here is a Canadian, and we are proud of it. That talk of loyalty to the empire is very much to be deprecated. Would any hon. member dare to accuse the Labour or Liberal leaders in the old country of being disloyal to Great Britain or the empire because they have seen fit to oppose and criticize these agreements? The Labour party there have plainly stated that they will not support this agreement, and if returned to power, they assert, they will abrogate the treaty entirely. Will any hon. gentleman accuse such men as Sir Herbert Samuel, Arthur Henderson, Philip Snowden and others of equally high standing of disloyalty to the motherland or to the empire, merely because they have made such statements? Of course not. Then why accuse hon. members in this house of such a base thought? Why accuse them of disloyalty either to Canada or to the empire merely because they stand up here and dare to criticize the agreements that have been signed? And just remember that it was the same Philip Snowden who, when resigning, is credited with saying that the agreements were being rushed through before the full story at Ottawa was known.

I should like at this time to join my protest with that of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) when he said that nothing had been done at the conference in regard to unemployment. It was an economic conference, but economics was the one thing that was not discussed. Unemployment, the gravest problem facing not only Canada but the entire world today, received no attention. There was, however, one delegate who had in mind something different from trade agree-

ments. Trade agreements had only recently been signed with New Zealand and a little earlier with Australia. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Bruce, who made some very pertinent remarks at the opening of the conference. He said:

Our accomplishment, however, is not limited by what we can achieve in the realm of intra-empire trade. I believe that in monetary policy we can take action which will be a contribution towards the restoration of prices, confidence and stability.

Today the world is not suffering from any lack of commodities. The production of wealth has, with the aid of science, attained to a point never previously reached and is sufficient to provide a standard of living higher than has previously existed. Yet we have millions of people unemployed, and the general standard of living is declining. This position is a challenge to our civilization. To fail to find a solution is an indictment of statesmanship in the empire and throughout the world. All peoples are looking for a lead on this problem. Let us here at Ottawa attempt to give it. There is no reason why we cannot within our own group of nations, associated as we assuredly would be with other nations whose monetary policy is closely linked to ours, take the first steps to restore world trade. Such a development would gain the adherence of many other countries and with the strength thus gathered the way would be paved for the solution of what is perhaps the greatest problem that has ever baffled mankind.

Here was one delegate who evidently expected that more matters than trade agreements were to be discussed. As I have already said, trade agreements had only recently been signed with New Zealand and Australia. Having in mind all this and also the fact that practically every person who has given a rudimentary study to the subject of economics will and indeed does admit that tariff barriers have stifled the trade of the world, with the result that standards of living for millions of the people of the world have disappeared, let us ask ourselves seriously this question: Has Ottawa shown the world a way, or is this just another high tariff policy of the Conservative party, fastened upon the Canadian people for five years and also binding the hands of future parliaments for that length of time so far as world trade is concerned? That is the question as it appears to me. Has the conference given a lead in the matters Mr. Bruce spoke of, or is this merely another trade agreement binding future parliaments for five years in regard to trade not only with the colonies and the motherland but, as well, with the countries of the world at large?

I wish to dwell for a moment on the effect of tariffs generally. Tariffs in the early days were introduced I believe as a source of revenue. Later on, tariffs were divided some-