

Customs Tariff

had to unload the carload of bricks and rubber stamp each brick, "product of Canada."

Now, it seems to me—

Mr. Graydon: That is the brick for brick tariff wall.

Mr. Coldwell: There is no question about that. It seems to me that if we are going to make concessions, if it is only two per cent or a fraction of one per cent against the customer who has in past years been our best customer, we should pause before we agree to a provision of this sort. Because of the Geneva agreement and the non-discriminatory features of this agreement, we have made some quite valuable concessions to the United States, and have placed some considerable barriers against our trade with the United Kingdom. While I think we must do whatever we can to improve our trade relationship with the United States as well as with Britain, I do not think these arrangements should be one-sided, and they should make a greater effort than they have been making to remove these rigid regulations which they used from time to time to prevent the importation into their country of goods from Canada and from other countries. I believe that is the important point.

Mr. Sinclair: I am glad the hon. member has raised this matter. In the resolution stage I said that although we have not introduced formal legislation so far as the Geneva trade agreement is concerned, we have given statutory effect to about 465 out of almost 1,000 items considered at either Geneva or Annecy. One of the few advantages I can think of, in so far as these continuing conferences are concerned, is that at Geneva certain agreements were reached. We came back to the various countries at the next conference and were able to show that we had done a great deal towards implementing that agreement. It is for that reason I want to see this bill passed. Then none of the signatories to these agreements will be in a better position than Canada. We shall be able to say, "We have done this; what have you done?" The other countries which have not made measurable advances in carrying out the spirit of Geneva are not going to be able to ask for further concessions.

When this bill is in effect, we can say we have gone still further in carrying out the provisions we agreed to at Geneva. I am very glad the hon. member raised the question of the marking of products because it is another example of a technique which has been used, quite aside from the provisions in the tariff to block the entry of goods from Canada into the United States. We are doing our part in this connection and I am told there is legislation before congress now. The

Americans apparently are also anxious to have their house in order before they take the next step. In section 3, when I come to it—I mentioned it in the resolution stage—we had an extra penalty. If the goods were not marked in accordance with our regulations we had, as well as a penalty, an extra 10 per cent ad valorem duty which we imposed. It was agreed that that sort of thing was actually in restraint of trade and the signatory countries should do away with this extra penalty. To hold goods and mark them at public expense was all right; but then to put on a penalty duty as well was not right. Here we are taking our action to correct the situation which the hon. member aptly described with regard to Annapolis valley apples and with regard to bricks.

Mr. Fulton: The answers given by the parliamentary assistant make the government's position clear; but I wonder if he can just give us some facts which will complete the picture. As I understood him, he said that we shall be in a position to say to these other nations, "We have gone very far to fulfil our part of the obligation." In fact, as I understand him, he said we had gone further than other nations had gone, so we shall be in a good bargaining position at Torquay. That may be a sound position to get into from the point of view of bargaining, but I do not think it is a sound position to get into unless we be sure that the other nations are going to agree. When we point out to them that we have gone this far and they have not, if we are not sure of that and if we go on taking the lead, we are definitely harming our trading prospects and particularly we are hurting the country which in the past has been our best customer. I should like to know, though not in any detail, how far the United States has gone. I suggest that the parliamentary assistant tell us generally whether in fact these tactics of ours have succeeded in bringing the United States as far along the road as we would like to see them go.

Mr. Sinclair: I am informed that, of the 23 countries that signed at Geneva and the 9 more that came in at Annecy, satisfactory action has been taken by all the countries of which we have record. It is difficult to check accurately, especially since there has not been much time since Annecy and most of these governments have had only one sitting of their parliaments; but at Torquay we shall know how far they have gone. If we have gone farther than any of them, then we will be in a position to mark time. But I am informed that we ourselves and Britain, the people who are of course most interested in export trade, are the countries that have done