

Mr. EULER: They have increased their purchases from us by over 100 per cent.

Mr. MANION: I did not look up the figures, but I know very well it is not a very good bargain when you hand out these concessions to twenty-five or thirty nations who give nothing in return to the people of this country, especially when you have a tariff system under which you can ask something in return. Evidently this government works on the principle that it is more blessed to give than to receive, forgetting the other principle that charity begins at home. I submit also that, as many others have said on other occasions, it might be well to attend to the straightening out of this most favoured nation business, because I do not believe any government should be handing out favours to countries which are not asked to give anything in return. I am not questioning that there are advantages in this agreement; it would be a queer kind of agreement if it did not produce any benefit. But when the losses and gains are weighed, my submission is that there is grave doubt of the advantages being more than the disadvantages so far as we are concerned.

I want to deal with another aspect which has been greatly stressed. One speaker who preceded me, I think the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Matthews), spoke of it this afternoon, and it is mentioned in the speech from the throne; that is the supposedly patriotic ground on which we should receive the gift of this trade agreement. In the speech from the throne it is stated that this treaty will further the ends of international goodwill. Perhaps it will. I am not going to quarrel with that statement, but I do not think the fact that we make a trade treaty with some countries is going to further the ends of international goodwill. The implication is—and it has been advanced and fostered by members of the government—that on account of our having a trade treaty with the United States, therefore the United States is going to be very much more friendly to the British Empire than in the past, and if there should be international difficulties, the United States will be much more ready to jump in and fight for the British Empire than it has been in the past. That is the suggestion, that because of this treaty the United States is going to be very much more inclined to tie itself up to the empire for war purposes. I do not admit any such suggestion. Does the Prime Minister think that is true?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will answer my hon. friend later on. I do not want to interrupt him.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. MANION: Perhaps it is just as well. No doubt the right hon. gentleman thinks it is true, or pretends he thinks it is true, which I suppose comes to the same thing. But I should like to point out that the United States has trade treaties with nineteen or twenty different countries. I jotted them down this afternoon, and they include a trade treaty with Czechoslovakia. They had that treaty before the trouble which arose last year. Did anybody notice the United States jumping into armour to go and fight for Czechoslovakia? The only thing I heard from the United States was a great deal of abuse heaped upon Neville Chamberlain for bringing about peace because, as they said, he was selling out the democracies. They have trade treaties with Belgium, with Sweden, with The Netherlands and with France. Does anybody suggest that if Germany should choose to invade Sweden or Belgium or The Netherlands, the United States are going to fight any more readily because they happen to have a trade treaty? My impression is that all this is just so much twaddle. Incidentally, we have twenty-five or thirty trade treaties with other countries, including Germany, Italy and Japan. Does the fact that we have trade agreements with these dictator nations make us any the less likely to oppose their ideas or their principles of dictatorships? Does it make it at all likely that we are going to favour them if there is any international trouble? Why to me, I repeat, the whole idea of putting the matter on patriotic grounds is just so much twaddle. I do not think trade is based on patriotic grounds; trade is carried on under business principles. The trouble is that the people of the United States—and again I say this without disrespect, because I am very fond of them—are very close traders. They are hard-headed business men, and when they trade with this government or at least this group they always get the best of it. That is the principle they work on, and they carry it through.

It has been said that, because of the claim that on patriotic grounds this treaty is going to help the empire, the agreement may be the issue at the next election. Until the recent imbroglio in Ontario there was the suggestion that national unity might be the issue. Well, sir, this government is not going to choose the issue. That will be done by the people; that has been done by the people already, and the issue is going to be the record of this government, its activities and its masterly inactivity, to my mind much more inactive than masterly. What I suggest is that we should have less ballyhoo and propa-