

or ten years with that customer, no matter how closely we may be bound by ties of blood and sentiment or anything else? We are being asked to tie up exclusively for three, five or ten years with a client with whom for years we have done the least business. At page 10 of the report I find the following:

In 1932 the United States and the United Kingdom supplied Canada with 79.2 per cent of her total imports. The United States since 1882 has supplied the dominion continuously, year by year, with the largest proportion of its imports, amounting to 60.8 per cent in 1932 compared with 64.5 per cent in 1931.

Page 11 of the report contains the following statement:

The United States has occupied first place in Canadian export trade during the past six years.

I do not contend that we should deal exclusively with the United States but surely a treaty could be arranged with the empire which would not disregard totally some of our best clients.

There are many reasons why I have the greatest reverence and sympathy for dear old England and if the terms made by the Prime Minister are considered mercenary, I have had nothing to do with them. Our imports in 1932 from the United States were 60.8 per cent, while in 1931 they amounted to only 64.5. Our imports from the United Kingdom in 1932 amounted to 18.4 per cent, and in 1931, 16.5 per cent. In those two periods our imports from the United Kingdom were 18.4 per cent and 16.5 per cent respectively, while our imports from the rest of the world amounted to 81.6 per cent and 83.5 per cent. Our exports to the United States in 1932 amounted to 40.8 per cent, to the United Kingdom, 30.2 per cent and to the whole world 69.8 per cent. Page 10 of the report contains the statement that Canada's domestic exports to the United Kingdom in 1932 decreased by 33.1 per cent as compared with 1931. I have no hesitation in saying that the whole plan is economically unsound, both for Canada and for the empire. It is too radical. I am driven more and more to the conclusion with all due respect that it was entered into for the sole purpose of endeavouring to save the Prime Minister's face.

Then we must consider the state of health of the two contracting parties. If the law of eugenics was recognized in contractual law, these agreements would be *contra bonos mores*. But more than that, in the present state of world affairs, these agreements are unsound and strike at the root of responsible government as heretofore understood in British institutions.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Where do the people and the consumers of Canada, where do the people and the consumers of Great Britain come into these agreements? Where do the parties to these agreements get their authority so to bend the peoples of the empire? By what virtue have they arrogated unto themselves the right to be constituted the guardians, trustees or committees of the peoples of the empire in the matters now under review? Surely the government of Canada cannot claim any mandate from the Canadian people to enter into such conventions. Were these conventions before the people in 1930? Nothing was mentioned although many promises were made by the Prime Minister, all still unfulfilled. If there has ever been a system—I do not think that expression will be considered unparliamentary—whereby power was taken away from the people of Canada, it was that adopted by the Prime Minister during the elections of 1930. I ask hon. members of the government by what mandate of the people do they endeavour to put this matter through the Canadian parliament? The mandate which they obtained in 1930 could not be obtained today. The Canadian people want better proof, as is demonstrated by the fact that the elected member for South Huron (Mr. Golding) has taken his seat in the house. The fact that that hon. member is today a member of this house should be forever in the mind of the Prime Minister to remind him that he and his followers have no mandate to place before the Canadian parliament the conventions presently under review. The government made these matters an issue in the campaign in South Huron and to my recollection there has never been so clear a signal of defeat as that given by the returns in that election.

The increasingly high walls of protection which have been built and which, because of a complacent majority in this house, will continue to be built by the Prime Minister and his followers bear upon their face that warning, "mene mene tekel upharsin" or the handwriting on the walls, be they so high! There will be a destruction and crumbling down of those walls as soon as the Canadian people again have an opportunity of recording their votes.

The Prime Minister may endeavour to put these matters through our house with all possible haste, the authority in power in Great Britain may want to do the same, but where is the Prime Minister's mandate? He obtained a mandate to end unemployment because of the promises he made that he would do so as soon as he was returned to power; he obtained a mandate to open wide