

Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement

Cattle

Heavy cattle (over 700 pounds per head), reduction on 155,799 head annually, from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound.

United States imports: 1929, \$9,900,000; 1934, \$4,000.

Calves, (under 175 pounds), reduction on 51,933 head annually, from 2½ cents to 1½ cents per pound.

United States imports: 1929, \$1,000,000; 1934, \$3,000.

Dairy cows (over 700 pounds), reduction on 20,000 head annually, from 3 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

United States imports: 1929, (estimated), \$500,000; 1934, (estimated), \$2,000.

With regard to the concessions on cattle, there is no mention in the agreement before us of the price arrangement referred to by the Mail and Empire, which was a matter of maintaining a certain parity of price as between agricultural and manufactured products. Had anything of that kind existed in this agreement, it would have materially affected the whole agreement from the point of view of the benefit to be derived from its provisions by the cattle industry. There is nothing concerning parity price in the present agreement. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that just taking what appears to be a more or less accurate statement of the situation, which I should say was probably inspired, there is ample evidence that the agreement as it is before the house for approval goes very much further in the interests of Canada than anything my right hon. friend found it possible to obtain prior to the time he went out of office.

I might mention other features. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Stewart) took a characteristic line, when indicating what he termed the many concessions the United States got compared with what Canada secured. He started off with oranges. I think this is as good an illustration as could be used; he said:

Let us see what Canada gives, as compared with what she gets. She gives concessions on oranges to the value of \$21,000,000—

First, as to the meaning and accuracy of the figures used, what does my hon. friend mean when he says that the United States got concessions to the extent of \$21,000,000 on oranges? I do not know where he obtained his figures; I am told that according to our own statistical department the duty collected on oranges since they were placed on the dutiable list by the late administration, that is for the four years combined, was less than \$5,000,000, and that the value of imports of oranges from all countries in the peak year, 1929, was only \$9,500,000, while the com-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

bined imports of the last four years totalled less than \$21,000,000. Yet my hon. friend from Leeds says, "Look at the concession the United States got, \$21,000,000 on oranges."

What I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is this: In discussing this agreement hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have considered only the alleged interests of producers, even where, as in the case of oranges, there are no producers in Canada. They have not had one word to say for the poor consumer, all the way through. Yet so far as Canada is concerned every one is a consumer, and there is not a producer who does not also receive something from any benefit obtained by consumers. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat says, "Where is the help for the manufacturers in this agreement?" Well, if the consumers are going to derive the great benefit hon. gentlemen opposite would seem to imagine through the intermediate tariff being granted to the United States, that is going to be of assistance to every manufacturer in the country because it will increase the real wages of the workingmen of Canada, and whatever will help the manufacturers or producers lessen the cost of production and the cost of living is going to be of material help to the manufacturers and producers themselves. There is in addition the demand for manufactured goods which will come from the purchasing power derived from the sale of Canada's primary and other products in the United States. But for each single producer in the country it is difficult to say just how many consumers there are; we are all consumers, and the difference between hon. gentlemen opposite and ourselves is that we have been looking to the well-being of the consumers as well as to that of the producers. They have been confining their attention almost exclusively to what is going to benefit certain special or vested interests in the country.

I need not enlarge upon the benefits afforded by the agreement to consumers; the benefits run all through the agreement, but may I say that what might have been a substantial benefit to consumers five years ago through giving to the United States or other countries the intermediate tariff is very much less of a benefit to-day. In many particulars the intermediate tariff to-day is almost the same as the general tariff. During the time my right hon. friend was in office he hardly let a session go by, in fact, I do not think he did let a session go by, without jacking up the tariff somewhat higher, and in particular bringing the intermediate tariff nearer to the level of the general tariff. As a result, when to-day we speak of giving another country the bene-