

*Supply—Trade and Commerce*

agreements all you like; you can talk about them taking advantage of escape clauses all you like, but two things stand out in my mind. United States farmers were reasonably cared for in the face of the surplus problem, and some of the hungry nations were fed. I do not think that would have been a bad record for any Canadian government, whether Liberal or Conservative, to have hung on it. Our farmers would be satisfied too if they were paid for their production that is in surplus, and they would be very pleased to know that those surpluses had been used to feed some of the hungry nations of the world.

I realize that the minister has his problems, and I do not want to be too harsh with him. We are going to give him time; but once again before taking my seat I say that rather than the "big show" we want to know what results are actually accomplished, and whether or not the people of Canada are going to have the purchasing power to buy that which is available.

**Mr. Harrison:** Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to rise in a debate that is very important not only to western Canada but to Canada generally, and discuss some of the policies being followed at the moment to generate more trade. The difference between prosperity and the reverse is our ability to trade successfully with other nations. When we are able to do that successfully we have prosperity in the country, and when we are not able to do so we have difficult times. Maybe that is why in the past we have always thought of Tory times as hard times. In years gone by the Tories have not been too successful in trading with other nations.

When I look at the program we have before us now it strikes me as very similar to some we have seen before. To summarize, as I see it, this is a five point program. First the Prime Minister went to England to a prime ministers' conference, where he indicated to the British that he wanted to increase trade with that country, and in order to do so he would naturally have to remove at least some of the barriers that exist. If you want to increase the flow of anything you take away any impediments that may be in the way, whether it is a question of rivers or trade. That was the first point.

Second, the Prime Minister invited a British delegation to Mont Tremblant to discuss these proposals and to make arrangements for a commonwealth conference next year. Third, we had the Canadian trade mission of four cabinet ministers who went to Washington to discuss trade with the United States. The fourth step was the three-week

visit to Great Britain of the 50-man trade mission in order to buy British goods. Fifth, there is the commonwealth trade conference next year. We can discuss the first four because they are all completed or nearly so but the fifth, the commonwealth trade conference, we can only discuss on a crystal ball basis.

With regard to the first, the Prime Minister's trip to Great Britain, I think his speech there to the effect that he wanted to increase trade was very laudable. I am sorry that what he said there has not been backed up by what has transpired since. He said he wanted to increase trade with that nation and they took him at his word. When they came to the Mont Tremblant conference later they said that if he wanted to remove restrictions—and that is the only way you can increase trade—why not have maximum trade by removing all restrictions? There is every indication that both he and the Minister of Finance, who attended the Mont Tremblant conference, took to the woods as soon as that was mentioned. Two or three days later Mr. Thorneycroft and the other members of the British delegation came to Ottawa, and they got a very cold reception as far as that proposition was concerned.

Knowing the Conservative tradition of being a high tariff party I can understand that, but I think there has to be some revision of thinking on the other side of the house. We are entering new phases as far as trading is concerned, and one that should give them pause is the new European free trade area comprising six countries, Great Britain, West Germany, France, Holland, Italy and Belgium. I understand that their free trade agreement goes into effect on January 1, 1958, and involves a 10-year process before complete free trade is assured among them. But once this European free trade community is in operation it will mean a market of 160 million people, very similar to what we have across the border in the United States, which is regarded as the best market in all the world. Possibly the 160 million people in the European market are not as prosperous as those south of the border, but still they are prosperous indeed.

When the new concept of trading comes into effect in Europe one thing we will have to look at is the fact that the old Tory practice of increasing tariffs, for instance, against British textiles or anything else will at once affect this large free trade area and any counter measures that may be taken by them will be taken as a unit. In other words, if we take measures against West German products coming into this market we will incur the ire of Great Britain and all the