

treaty or trade agreement that has been entered into—I suppose the two words are more or less interchangeable. There was, as I say, such a flood of ballyhoo and propaganda about this agreement with the United States that the press release took, as I said a few moments ago, about forty-six pages of small print. Those who might have opposed the treaty were shocked into silence. Almost no one has attempted to state even a few truths about it. However, I have not been frightened off and I am going to say a few words. I think it is worth while for the house and the country to know something about it.

I shall endeavour at this time to show some of the weaknesses in this treaty. The government have attempted to show what they claim are its advantages, but no one in or out of the house is capable of judging at once the full effects of the treaty. Only time can tell. This probably gives my right hon. friend a little advantage, especially after the ballyhoo that has been issued, because he has the power to call an election before that necessary time has elapsed. But I am going to show a few of the weaknesses. I am not going to attempt a complete discussion of the matter; I shall make only a few general observations.

I want to state frankly that I believe in trade agreements. I believe that it is one of the methods by which we can build up world trade. Trade agreements are necessary under the conditions of to-day. The world is made up of interdependent countries. It is of advantage, not only to us but to the world generally, to build up trade, provided always that any trade agreement which is made is fair to both sides. I do not think we should try to take advantage of the other party to the agreement, but I believe we should get as fair a deal as he does. I do not question the statement that certain groups in this country are benefited by certain provisions of the agreement. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that we must consider this country, not as nine provinces, not as nine different nations, not as different sections or different groups, but as one nation. We must take the treaty as a whole and endeavour to see if it is just and fair to us. Let us see what the advantages are from the treaty as a whole, and not consider it simply from the standpoint of its effect upon, for example, the cattle raising industry of the west, which effect may be more than counterbalanced by the treaty's effect on some industry in the east, or on perhaps some other industry in the west.

There have been perhaps more or less *sub rosa*, many complaints against this treaty,

but the industries of the country may have been too frightened to express their opinions about it. Some of them appear to think it would be more or less unpatriotic to express an opinion against the treaty. I shall deal with the patriotic side of it in a few moments.

To take a specific example, there came under my notice a protest which was being sent to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) from the boot and shoe industry, pointing out the great damage that was going to be done to it, and setting forth that imports of boots and shoes from the United States in 1938 were more than double the amounts imported from the United States during the previous year.

Mr. EULER: Less than two per cent of the consumption.

Mr. MANION: All right, perhaps, but we must not overlook the fact that every pair of boots and shoes that is imported from the United States takes work out of the hands of some of our Canadian workmen and food out of the mouths of some of our Canadian people. It was some of the people who manufacture boots and shoes in that part of the country from which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Euler) comes who made this protest to the Minister of Finance.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MANION: I saw the protest. I suggest this, that if our people were being charged more for Canadian boots and shoes, or if our boots and shoes were not the equal of the United States product, there might be some reason for encouraging imports; but my submission, and my personal observation, from what I have been able to observe on various trips to the United States, is that our Canadian boots and shoes are just as cheap and just as good as those made in the United States, so I cannot see any great advantage in damaging our own boot and shoe industry. I said that last year we imported from the United States twice as many boots and shoes as in the previous year, and my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce interjected that the imports were less than two per cent of the consumption. I do not know what the percentage is, and so I cannot quarrel with his statement. But I repeat that, without this new trade treaty, our imports of boots and shoes from the United States last year were twice what they were in the previous year, and under the new treaty our imports will probably be much greater than in the past.