

*The Address—Mr. Mackenzie King*

tageous to both sides. But when it comes to commercial negotiations or customs legislation, all this ceases to have any significance.

And a little further on in the same paragraph:

The phraseology of war is constantly used in discussions of commercial relations. We hear of attacks upon domestic industry, defense against foreign aggression, industrial invasion, boring from within, the conquest of markets. One is almost ashamed to speak of mutual gain, friendly cooperation, emulation that stimulates to betterment all around.

Does my hon. friend take all of that to heart? Did he have that paragraph in mind when he talked of an economic menace as he has done wherever he has gone in referring to our relations with the United States? When we were selling to the United States, it was an economic menace. If we were exporting our raw materials to the United States it was parting with our estate, selling our birth-right; it was an economic menace. If goods were bought from the United States in some way that too was an economic menace; the home market was being invaded. If the United States threatened to raise its tariff walls, that was in some way or other an economic menace: we would then be prevented from selling. Whether selling to, buying from or prevented from selling to the United States, it was always an economic menace. I would suggest to my hon. friend the wisdom of perusing with great care this article from beginning to end. May I read the concluding paragraph?—it is very pertinent to discussions in this house.

Mr. BOURASSA: Spare him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Professor Tausig says:

In all these matters, it is the direction in which we move that chiefly counts. At the present juncture in international affairs, more depends on the spirit which we show than on the precise things which we do. The Kellogg treaty is perhaps, as some of its critics say, no more than a gesture. But it is a noble gesture, and points the way in which mankind should think and the direction in which we should move. So with the disarmament negotiations. It makes no great difference just how we figure on parity between different ships and different ordnance. But it makes all the difference in the world whether we proceed wholeheartedly on the supposition, the expectation, and the fervent wish, that peace is to prevail in the future, not war. Everyone who has meditated on the underlying causes of international friction and combat cannot but feel that it is the spirit which signifies. We must have a new and better attitude toward foreign countries. We must dismiss the language of war when we speak of our intercourse and trade with them. Something other than suspicion and enmity must sink into our hearts. It is from this higher point of view that we may well consider, not only the peace treaties which we are invoking and the disarmament which we

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

promote, but our commercial policy as well. Shall we continue to suspect, to fear, and to cultivate fear? To treat the foreigner from whom we get goods as always an enemy and an intruder? To circumvent him, bully him, rouse his resentment and his irritation? Or shall we treat him as we wish to be treated ourselves? Here too it is the spirit that signifies.

That concluding paragraph, Mr. Speaker, seems to me to sum up as conclusively as any words possibly could, the attitude of the present administration with respect to all phases of our international relations. Whether our international relations have to do with matters of trade, whether they have to do with disarmament, whether they have to do with treaties,—with whatever they have to do, the spirit of this administration is the same; it is to seek to foster good-will and to lessen ill-will, to treat neighbours as neighbours and to treat the several countries of the world as though they were members of one great human family, members, who, it was intended, should dwell together in unity and good-will.

I have said to my hon. friend that he may find that during the course of the year he will be given, along with others, an opportunity of presenting his views to the public at large. I do not wish this remark to lead to any misunderstanding. I wish to make the position perfectly clear. As respects the date at which a general election is to be held, that matter has not as yet been considered by the government. Under the British system there is a limit fixed, I think very wisely, beyond which no government can be permitted to remain in office without appealing to the people. There is also, equally wisely, I believe, the practice of permitting as occasions may arise an appeal to the electorate in order to secure its support of an administration with respect to any matter of outstanding concern to the people at large. Whether an election will come this year or next year will depend upon developments which may take place—not in a foreign country only, but in our own and within the empire. I do not for one minute hesitate to say that tariff changes which may be made in another country might occasion an appeal to the people in this Dominion with respect to the attitude which the government might propose taking towards them. My hon. friend states that I have said that an election would depend on what takes place at Washington. I made no representation of that kind. But I will tell him this, that I can imagine a situation arising in connection with the tariff of this country which might very well be the occasion of an appeal to the people of the Dominion on the part of the present administration.