

quite tactful in their positions—serve as so many buffers to hold you off. You cannot find what you want. How happy one would feel if, instead of having to disturb, say the Minister of Finance, one could talk to a parliamentary secretary. He would be one of our fraternity. A previous occupant of the chair once declared that this house was the greatest club in Canada, and it is. When I come to Ottawa to discuss something with a minister, I do not necessarily wish to disturb the minister, and if I could talk to a secretary who was one of our own fraternity, that would be perfectly satisfactory. He would honour my given word and I would honour his. But the Prime Minister has failed to introduce legislation to make this possible. Nothing has been done about it—another example of the do-nothing policy of this government.

Restore parliamentary responsibility! My time is going too fast to permit me to do more than refer to the twenty commissions, which cost the country nearly \$2,000,000 and created a few jobs, as my leader said yesterday. When his party was sitting here and we were sitting there, how the present Prime Minister railed about the commissions that we appointed! But did the right hon. gentleman restore parliamentary responsibility? I do not think he did. It is another broken promise. These commissions are set to work while I and other hon. members, sent here by our people for that purpose, could do a great deal of it.

The government did put through some trade agreements, and are probably going to put through another. In 1936 the following words were put into the mouth of the governor general:

My ministers believe that the Canada-United States agreement will mark a great improvement in Canada's international economic relations; also, that the principles embodied in this agreement, extended and applied with vigour and determination, will contribute to the reversal of the trend toward extreme economic nationalism, which has been undermining standards of living. . . .

This is 1936, mind you. There is no such reference to "vigour and determination" in the 1939 recital.

I think that when the Prime Minister is really tired, a good position for him would be at the league of nations, giving lectures on economic nationalism. Perhaps he could tell dear old Britain that she should not have an import advisory board advising the board of trade, or have the board of trade represented in the cabinet. Perhaps he could lecture on civilization. But of all the countries to be lectured on economic nationalism this country is the last, for a few reasons

which I shall recite. And when I recite them I ask hon. members and the country to visualize what I bring to their attention. When under the old agreement imports into Canada were permitted to jump from \$300,000,000 in 1934 to \$430,000,000 in 1937, an increase of 42 per cent, hon. gentlemen may have thought they tore down some economic nationalism, but in fact they tore away from thousands of people the possibility of applying their workmanship to the manufacture and production in Canada of required goods. In secondary industry alone, imports jumped from \$120,000,000 in 1935 to \$215,000,000 in 1937, an increase of 80 per cent. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Euler) knows, I know and the house knows that the maximum amount of work is provided in these secondary industries. To put it in figures, look at a dozen balance sheets; you will find that raw material costs, say 50 per cent; labour, 20 per cent; cost of production, another 20 per cent, and interest and so on, 5 per cent; and if there is 5 per cent left he is fortunate. Take the 20 per cent which is straight labour; on that basis the trade agreement of 1936 took away the opportunity of work from 50,000 Canadian people. That is the fact with regard to that agreement I have not time to go into details.

In the speech from the throne this year we are told that we are to approve another trade agreement, fulfilling the hope expressed in the speech from the throne last year that an agreement would be reached which would confirm and enlarge the advantages of the 1935 agreement with the United States. And we are told that, taken with the United Kingdom-United States agreement, it constitutes a constructive contribution toward a betterment of world conditions. When were we in Canada put in charge of world conditions? Is it not about time we looked after the condition of our own people a little more? That is the way I feel about the situation; when we have distress at home, let the world look after itself and let us look after ourselves. Are the nations to be saved by making us hewers of wood and drawers of water for the United States? That world appeasement, in my opinion, is all humbug and eye-wash. I do not see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in his seat; I do not know whether he is feeling too friendly towards this agreement. Speaking to the Halton County Liberal-Progressive association at Milton, Ontario, on November 18, he is reported in the *Toronto Telegram* as follows:

He pointed out that he had reason to believe that the concessions Canada was compelled to give would not do the dominion any harm.