

the immediate course of action results from powers that were given to the President, nevertheless I think that the Republican as well as the Democratic party has a greater appreciation of the fact that from political and economic points of view it is absolutely necessary for the United States to have mutually satisfactory arrangements with countries that think and believe as it does. Today neither the United States nor any other nation can wrap a cloak around itself and say, as might have been said twenty or thirty years ago, that it is not interested in the rest of the world. We must realize that changes have taken place in Great Britain with respect to credit and materials, and that the future may bring still further changes. For instance, many of the overseas resources and investments from which Britain received the income to buy more goods than she sold have been lost. From our point of view she may not be the ready market she has been in the past. I believe we should give careful consideration to the questions surrounding the stability of markets.

In view of the close relationship between the economies of Canada and the United States, I personally regret that the members of our Parliament and the members of their Congress, are only remotely acquainted. I am the government leader in the Senate and a member of the government, but I must confess that it was only through the recent United Nations meetings that I made the acquaintance of two members of the United States Senate. Previous to those meetings I did not know one American senator. I would go so far as to say that the matter of trade should be a subject for discussion between the legislators of the two countries. After all, the representatives of the people in the United States are, like ourselves, men of good will, and I think we should know more about their problems and they should be more familiar with ours. In the final analysis it is public opinion which decides these important matters.

Honourable senators, I believe I have contributed all I can to this debate. It will be observed that I have scarcely touched upon the details of the agreement. Again I suggest that I could make the detailed information available to honourable members in a more effective manner if the subject-matter were referred to a committee.

In conclusion may I say that I believe that Canada's future, and particularly that of my native province of Nova Scotia, is completely tied up with world trade. It must be remembered that the trend of the nations of the world, particularly the great trading nations bordering on the Atlantic ocean, is towards a

customs union. If as a result of trade strangulation we, a maritime country, have lost our primary trade position, and fail to take advantage of the present trends, which we hope mean something, we will have nobody to blame in future but ourselves. Canada is not on the fringe of the economic unit, but is virtually in the centre of world activities.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable members, in my few remarks I wish to deal first with the closing comments of the honourable leader of the government. I concur in his suggestion that this resolution should be referred to a committee where we could hear the representatives and officials of the government who did the actual work of arranging the agreements. I would go a step further, and suggest that business organizations and others throughout Canada should have their representatives appear before us and explain how the agreements will affect them.

I notice by the *Debates* of the House of Commons that a committee of that house has been proposed to consider this same problem. Why could we not have a joint committee on this subject, as we have had on other matters? In that way we would secure wider publicity and a better understanding of the problems existing throughout Canada. As I understand the practice of the other house, the general committees are not set up until after the Speech from the Throne is disposed of. If this joint committee were to sit while the other house is engaged in debating the Speech from the Throne, there would be less interference from other committees.

I appreciate the very exhaustive history of tariffs and agreements which has been given by the honourable leader of the government. After some consideration of the agreements I must admit that they require a great deal of study. It would seem that when regulations are made they are accompanied by escape clauses. Of course I can understand that in the preparation of the agreements our negotiators, in order to gain something, had to make certain concessions, and it may be that these escape clauses were necessary. We all appreciate that frequently it is not tariff walls that keep our goods out of other countries, but rather the regulations within those countries with which we cannot comply.

The honourable leader has pointed out that Great Britain, France and other countries whose governments are doing bulk buying may say, "We have agreements with Canada, but we are not going to buy her goods." I have no inside information, but I understand that negotiations with respect to trade agreements between Great Britain and ourselves