

the hon. gentlemen have been in politics and sitting in this house so long, not associated with business, that they do not understand the effect of the treaty and have no vision of the results which may flow from it. Canada should have retaliated when the Fordney-McCumber tariff was imposed, and the Hawley-Smoot tariff—

Mr. STEWART: Countervailing duties.

Mr. SPENCE: Oh, countervailing duties have meant nothing. We know that congress has control; no matter how friendly the president appears to be to this country, he cannot reduce the duty more than 50 per cent, and he might well do that and still have higher duties against us than we have against them. So what position were we in to negotiate a treaty with them?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPENCE: Mr. Speaker, just before six o'clock I had made certain references to some ministers of national revenue who at times had not given the trade with which I was associated a square deal. In justice to the present Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Isley) may I say that a few weeks ago I did hear that he was now getting more familiar with customs details in Toronto, and with customs transactions generally, and that a better deal was being given to everybody concerned. I have not been associated with the trade for the last two or three years, so I believe it is only fair to say that opinion seems to be that he is getting more familiar with it.

Since I have been in the house I have known only one trade treaty which has had any beneficial effects on this country, and that was the Canada-United Kingdom agreement brought about in 1932 by the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPENCE: Hon. members may laugh as they like, but if they are not stupid they should know that is the only beneficial trade treaty we ever had. Under it we received a preference of 4s 6d per 100 pounds on apples. A few days ago the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Kinley) was trying to defend the government in its negotiation of the present treaty. He said that Nova Scotia still had a good deal on apples. The deal they get is that in the present treaty their duty is cut from 4s 6d to 3s per 100 pounds. That is what they lost.

And what about wheat? When any hon. minister will say that a loss of six cents a bushel on wheat does not make any difference, surely he is not familiar with the business. A loss of six cents a bushel means what? It means competition in the old country market. That preference was a profit in itself.

Let us turn our minds back to the French treaty of 1923. That was another treaty negotiated by the party now in office. I remember well that it was another knock for the fruit and vegetable business, more particularly for the fruit business. In the Toronto market we had been selling thousands of baskets of the best cherries in each cherry season to the extract men of Toronto and other parts of the dominion, for the purpose of making extracts. The French treaty killed that cherry market because it allowed Italy as well as France to ship cured cherries in here at a price less than the producer in Canada could accept. The result was that thousands of big Montmorency cherry trees were pulled out of the ground, because their fruit was worth nothing. The cherry market has not come back yet. That was another trade treaty which hurt the fruit and vegetable business.

Is it any wonder that people become alarmed when they try to do business at all? I claim there should be more cooperation between business and government. If business were consulted I am satisfied the people in it would be fair with the government. In the United States both industry and business were consulted in connection with the trade treaty we have just negotiated. But in Canada our departmental officials are supposed to know more about everything than men who have been trained in their own line of business. Such rot! It could not be possible, no matter how brilliant our young men in the departments may be, to know as much as the men who have been trained in a particular line of business. So I repeat that we did not get a fair deal.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) has said that unemployment is not the greatest problem. He has said that if peace were assured, we would be able to sell our wheat abroad, and that we would have a great recovery. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I consider that nothing but a smoke screen. The present government must be entirely out of touch with business. They ought to know that the real issue to-day is that in the last nine years we have spent \$900,000,000 on relief. Surely this indicates that unemployment is the real issue. I say again it is an indication that the government must be both deaf and dumb, and they have nothing to suggest to improve conditions. They are just drifting along, taking the advice of commissions.