

opposite were in power this country paid for American purchases no less than three billion dollars in excess of what they purchased from us. How this little country ever maintained its solvency in face of that adverse trade condition is almost beyond our comprehension.

I want to say this further with respect to United States tariff increases: Canadian wheat had been entering the United States duty free on a reciprocal basis during the Wilson administration, up to May 27, 1921. On that date the United States imposed a duty of 35 cents a bushel. The tariff act of September 21, 1922, reduced the rate to 30 cents, but on April 6, 1924, under the same flexible provision of the tariff, the duty was advanced to 42 cents a bushel, and the present tariff act of June, 1930, confirmed the rate. During the fiscal year, 1920-21, the last year of the old Conservative administration, the last year that Canadian wheat entered the United States free of duty, our exports to that country were \$91,442,298. Under the tariff of 1921-22 our exports dropped to \$23,335,277 and by the fiscal year ended March 31, 1930, under the 74 cents per bushel tariff, exports had fallen to \$7,487,000. That market for our wheat was lost during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. And the story is true all along the line with respect to the exportable surplus of our natural products.

What is the position with respect to wheat flour? During the fiscal year ended March 31, 1921, the last year wheat flour entered the United States free of duty, Canadian exports amounted to the huge sum of \$12,000,000. The tariff was raised against us in 1922, 1924 and 1930 and the trade dropped after 1924 to \$300,000 and the next year it was less than \$100,000. In whose regime and in what period of time was the market for our wheat flour in the United States lost to Canada? The same thing is true of oats. Prior to March 31, 1921, we exported oats to the United States to the value of \$4,694,519. The tariff was raised on September 21, 1922, to 15 cents per bushel, and increased to 16 cents on June 17, 1930, and by the fiscal year ended March 31, 1930, the export of oats to the United States had dropped from nearly \$5,000,000 to a trifling pittance of \$20,000.

Mr. RALSTON: On account of the one cent increase?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, the increase was to 15 cents first and then one cent afterwards. The total of 16 cents made it impossible.

Mr. RALSTON: But the 15 cents was 1922.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): September 21, 1922, after hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, and so far as we know they made no protest against it.

Mr. RALSTON: But the decrease was after the one cent was added in 1930.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There was no decrease, there was a further increase of one cent.

Mr. RALSTON: But the decrease in exports.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not know what the hon. gentleman is talking about.

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking about the decreased exports.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have only forty minutes; the hon. gentleman had unlimited time.

Mr. BRADETTE: He did not read his speech, though.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am reading from very full notes containing figures which I think I ought to read.

Cattle is an important item in Canadian production. Prior to May 27, 1921, cattle entered the United States market free of duty, and our exports of cattle to the United States for the fiscal year 1920 were \$42,495,963. For the fiscal year 1921, the last year they were free, they amounted to \$21,232,551. Next year they fell to \$3,712,821, the 30 per cent tariff being in force most of the time. The Fordney-McCumber tariff of September, 1922, imposed 2 cents per pound on heavy cattle and 1½ cents per pound on lighter cattle. Exports increased, reaching \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1930. Following this increase in trade the duty was raised in the tariff act of June, 1930, the new rates being 3 cents per pound on cattle weighing 700 pounds or more and 2½ cents per pound on lighter cattle. Under the increased tariffs, exports fell during the next fiscal year, 1931, to \$1,369,000 and have dropped further each year since.

The same story is true with respect to beef cattle, fresh beef, mutton and lamb, cream, butter, condensed milk, cattle hides and skins, leather and fish, and I suggest that the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, which they have repeated so many times in the house and oftener in the country, that the tariff policies of this party from 1930 on were responsible for the loss of our markets, has absolutely no foundation in fact and indeed is contrary to the record, which is as follows: