

are opposed to these tariff reductions are or rather have been followers of the Liberal party. My Liberal opponent in the campaign of 1935 stated that he was against a reduction in the tariff on fruits and vegetables, and I believe he made that statement in all sincerity because he is a fruit grower himself. Let me say right at this point that I know of hon. members sitting with the government who are just as much concerned with these reductions as I am. If they do not rise in their places in this house and speak against these reductions, the responsibility will be theirs. They will not be representing the people as they should.

We should encourage and make every effort to improve British empire trade instead of fiddling with this one-sided agreement with the United States. In this regard I should like to read part of an address given by the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, before the American farm bureau at Chicago, Illinois, on December 10, 1935: He said:

Some individuals and groups are trying to stir up farmers against other phases of the broad recovery program. Dispensers of discord are saying the farmers are being victimized by the new reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, and are painting pictures of a great flood of imports of farm products rushing across the border.

Agriculture, far from being crucified by this agreement, as some have told you, actually gains from it. We export more agricultural products to Canada than we have imported from her. We shall continue to do so for the very simple reason that the United States, with its larger area of agricultural land, its more varied climate—

That is one great thing in their favour.

—and its vastly greater population, produces far more of most agricultural products, including animal products, vegetables and fruits, than does Canada.

In the case of the few reductions that have been made, quota limitations are set on the amount that may be brought in at the lower rates. On the other side of the picture, we believe, and most unbiased men believe, that the general increase in our trade with Canada, including the exports of our factories, will so add to the purchasing power of hundreds of thousands of wage earners that they will be able to spend far more than they do today for the products of our own farms, our own forests, and our own fisheries.

To supplement that I should like to refer to an Associated Press dispatch from Kansas City, dated May 20, 1936, as follows:

Says United States Trade Agreements  
Are Bearing Fruit

The trade agreement with Canada came into force January 1st, 1936. Exports to Canada during the first two months totalled \$52,300,000 in contrast to \$46,100,000 for the same two months of 1935.

[Mr. Lennard.]

Of even more striking significance is the fact that the increase of exports on items on which Canada granted (tariff) concessions amounted to 26 per cent, whereas exports of nonconcession items increased by only eight per cent.

What do these trade agreements do for the market gardeners and fruit growers of this country? The following is one shining example of how they are being sold down the river. The United States' attitude with respect to these new trade agreements is as follows:

Certain concessions were made, one a reduction on frozen blueberries from Newfoundland. Why? Because they say Canada has made concessions on American strawberries and other berries which cover a large volume of trade.

How in the world is that going to keep many of our primary producers from going to the wall?

On page 60 of *Hansard* the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is reported as follows:

Men will not put out their money to invest in the different industries. They are withdrawing their capital from industry. Ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning), who is sitting here to-night, how much of the investment of capital to-day is going into government securities at a low rate of interest in comparison with what took place in former years. It has deprived manufacturing industry and our primary industries, and the like, of the capital they need. Why is that?

I will tell you why. Industrially Canada is virtually standing still. Foreign capital has practically deserted this market. Except in mining there have been few industrial developments during the past three years. There has been too much tariff uncertainty and labour unrest without the compensation of domestic economic stability. The Prime Minister said that the great majority of the people of Canada favoured the trade treaties. I venture the opinion that not one person in a thousand, if he were asked to-day what he thought of the new United States trade agreement, would say that he knew very much about it. And ninety-nine manufacturers out of a hundred, if asked the same question, would answer in a similar way, that they knew very little about these agreements at the moment. For anyone to say that these new trade agreements are acceptable to the people of Canada generally is absolute rot.

As regards the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, it seems strange to me that the government should spend thousands of dollars annually to collect licence fees to enable a concern to flourish over which they claim to have very little control. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I suggested on one occasion last session, that if this radio tax is necessary, it should be placed on the price of the