

to this country or the United States, or to any other country signing the general agreement, would be subject to a higher tariff than would those of a country that is a party to the agreement.

Hon. Mr. QUINN: Is the door not open to her?

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Yes, and to her satellites. The countries of western Europe are negotiating at present. Russia herself is not, but the door is open to her. If she does not participate in any agreement she will not have the advantage of the favoured-nation treatment that she would otherwise receive.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: Would that attitude by Russia more or less militate against some of the large manufacturers of this country? Years ago the Massey-Harris Company, for instance, was a big exporter to Russia, and for all I know it still may be. How would its business with Russia be affected as a result of this general agreement?

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: That company would be in the same position, I should say, as a manufacturer in Great Britain that desired to trade with Russia. The fact that Russia is not participating in this general agreement made at Geneva would have no effect upon possible trade between that country and Canada.

Hon. Mr. QUINN: Russia would be in the same position as any of her competitors, would she not?

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Yes.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR: Honourable senators, we are all indebted to the leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) for the comprehensive review that he gave when introducing this very important resolution. In the troubled state of the world today there is no surer way of promoting the relationships that are necessary between countries, if peace is to be maintained, than by encouraging in every way possible their trade and intercourse with one another. That is why I agree with the honourable senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) that the agreement referred to in the resolution is of paramount importance right now.

In the formative years of my young manhood I was greatly influenced by Morley's *Life of Richard Cobden*. Cobden was one of the founders of what later became known in Great Britain as the Manchester school, and while there has been a great deal of departure from the theories of that school, I think that in one respect they have stood the test of

time. Cobden's thesis was that there was no surer preventive of war than friendly trade between nations.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That is just as true today as it has been at any time in history. If we had had a visitor from Mars a few years after the last war I think he would have been amazed at the rampant growth of both political and economic nationalism throughout the world. I am bound to say that in my judgment the country to the south of our borders failed greatly after the last war. The honourable leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) in his contribution to the debate expressed a doubt as to the permanence that might be found in any trade arrangement that we made with the United States, and rather to my regret he intimated that we still must have regard to the protection of our industries in Canada and the maintenance of our standard of living. I had hoped that after his interjection yesterday in the debate on the Address he had somewhat changed his mind, and I think that on reflection he probably will change it.

If we are going to erect trade barriers on this or that pretext, then the grand international purpose behind this resolution will fail; and I really think that if it fails, one of the great hopes of the world today will fail with it.

It requires very little argument to convince one that what Canada needs more than anything else is future markets. Canada is a country with great potential resources, and if she can find the markets for her surplus foodstuffs, timber, commercial metals, fish and other commodities which she is capable of producing, she will have established the surest basis for an enduring prosperity.

If a lesson has been learned from the experiences of the past—and I believe that this applies to the United States more than to any other country—it is that trade is not a one-way street: if a country is to sell its products it must expect to buy the products of other countries.

I feel that the fear expressed by the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) in his brief contribution to the debate this afternoon is not fully justified. It is interesting to look at the history of the United States during the past forty years. We had an opportunity to negotiate a good trade arrangement in natural products with that country in 1911. I do not propose to thresh old straw, but 1911 is far enough back to afford an objective viewpoint. The trade arrangement with the United States was agreed