

Mr. McKINNON: Yes; unless we had a very flush product in June and July and had a carry over that we could not dispose of, it would be to no advantage.

Mr. KEMP: Passing on now, gentlemen, to the fish situation. The largest single fish item in which we are interested in the United States is probably fillets of cod and other ground fish. The United States tariff arrangement before Geneva was that there was a certain duty on a quota and a higher duty on imports exceeding that quota. The duty under the quota was bound, but the duty on ex-quota imports was not bound. As a result of the Geneva agreements, the quota remains the same, the duty under the quota is bound, and we have gained in that the duty on ex-quota imports into the United States, which beforehand was free, is now bound too. In other words, before Geneva the United States would have been free, if it saw fit, to raise the duty on imports of fish fillets from Canada in excess of our quota; under the Geneva agreements provisionably applied on January 1, they have now obligated themselves not to increase the duty on ex-quota imports.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: What was the duty before the agreements came into effect?

Mr. KEMP: The rates of duty have not been changed; they have been bound at the previous rates. The duty on ex-quota imports was and still is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound.

In other fishery products the maximum reduction has been given on a great many species. There are, I suppose, at least 50 or 60 different kinds of fish listed in the agreement; I shall not, therefore, try at the moment to go into them in detail, except to say that on nearly all species of fresh or frozen fish there has been a substantial reduction; there have also been reductions on smoked or kippered herring, pickled salmon and various other species. If you wish to ask questions about the fish in detail, we have the particulars here.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: What will be the duty on whitefish?

Mr. KEMP: I will have to look that up.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: The Senator wants to know if there is any change.

Mr. KEMP: There has been a reduction of $\frac{1}{4}$ cent a pound.

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: The maximum reduction on white fish?

Mr. KEMP: It was not the maximum but close to it. The rate was reduced from $\frac{3}{4}$ cent to $\frac{1}{2}$ cent a pound.

Mr. McKINNON: On most fish duties we got a 50 per cent reduction.

Mr. KEMP: We also obtained concessions on fish products in countries other than the United States. I refer to Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg—the Benelux custom union—where they have bound free entry of fish, fresh or chilled, salted, smoked or dried; and France has reduced her duties to Canada on canned salmon and canned lobster; Brazil reduced the duties on dried, salted codfish, and Cuba reduced on dried codfish; as well as taking off certain revenue duties which were a burden on imports, Czechoslovakia has undertaken to reduce the duties on salted herrings and preserved salmon; India, on canned fish; Norway, on canned lobster, canned salmon and salted salmon. It should be mentioned, however, that several of those countries have not yet put the reduction into effect, notably Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and Norway. We expect that all those countries will in due course put the reductions into effect, but they have not yet got around to doing it.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: They did not sign the agreement to put them into effect on the 1st of January, as the others did? I understand that those who signed the agreements were to put them into effect on January 1st.

Mr. KEMP: Those who signed the protocol of provisional application.