

situation, to take care of legitimate cases, and one of them, Senator Beaubien, is the one to which you refer. The clause says that the provisions of this paragraph, which do not allow the imposition of prohibitions shall not extend to the following—one of them is export prohibitions or restrictions—temporarily applied to prevent or relieve critical shortages of foodstuffs or other products essential to the exporting country. In other words, if we do run into a situation where there is a shortage of food, or of some other essential material, which causes a shortage situation which might be serious, we may then temporarily put on a prohibition to relieve the shortage.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: Would that be done by consultation with other countries with whom we have signed an agreement?

Mr. DEUTSCH: Normally we would consult them, but we would not have to if we had a good case, that is, if we could prove that because of shortages we would be facing serious difficulties if we did not act to relieve the situation. Under those circumstances we could put on temporary controls.

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: Is that the way in which we would stop the export of uranium to some of these countries to which we would prefer it did not go?

Mr. DEUTSCH: Uranium is especially excluded from this agreement.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Of course, Mr. Deutsch, we have an advantage under certain clauses with respect to such things as coal and petroleum products.

Mr. DEUTSCH: Yes.

Mr. McKINNON: Fuel oil. In other words, it works both ways.

Mr. DEUTSCH: It works very much both ways. We are very dependent upon other countries for raw materials which are absolutely essential to our economy, and while we have to give up perhaps certain unilateral rights, we benefit by the undertaking that other countries also give up certain unilateral rights.

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: I would take it that the provinces would be in much the same position as, for instance, the state of New York.

Mr. McKINNON: That is quite right.

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: We have certain sales in British Columbia and no doubt there are other provinces who must have the same conditions; I presume another province could do the same as we do.

Mr. McKINNON: Yes.

Mr. DEUTSCH: What the state of New York does with respect to milk is in some ways analagous to what our provinces do with respect to some other things.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: Do you mean to say that any province in Canada could prevent the export of certain materials produced in that province?

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: If that province owned the commodity.

Mr. DEUTSCH: Yes, if the province owns it.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: Do you mean if it belongs to the Crown?

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: Yes, if the Crown in the right of the province owns it.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: But it could not interfere with private ownership?

Mr. DEUTSCH: No. If the province is the owner of a natural resource, it would control it the same as the owner of any property would have control over it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions, gentlemen? Mr. Kemp, have you the statement on the agricultural products?

Mr. KEMP: I have those figures here of the concessions that we gained with respect to dairy products. The complete list from the United States is as follows:

Tariff Item 707, fresh cream; duty reduced from 28.3 cents per gallon to 20 cents a gallon, on a quota of 1½ million gallons, with no change in ex-quota rate