

The Address

tion for Canada, able to use this country and the farmers of this country as a dumping ground whenever it is convenient, and able in war to get for Canada and "the dear Old Mother Country" wheat raised by American farmers at a price limited by the American government. No wonder many emigrate from the United States into Canada.

It is hoped that Harding, during his administration, will do something to make the buying power of the United States profitable to Americans first, Canadians and other outsiders afterward.

Then let me quote from the American Economist, one of the foremost American papers supporting the Republicans:

It may be set down as final that the Canadian tariff revision will be purely with reference to Canadian interest and not that of the American exporter. That is the way Tariff revision ought to be undertaken. If the Canadian Government were to give first heed to the desires of the American exporter, it would be time for the Canadian people to put the Government on the scrap heap and to select one that could write across the papers of its legislation "Canada First."

I might state for the information of the House that that opinion was written before December 6. And yet we hear it suggested to-day that with our industrial and agricultural markets as they are, Parliament, instead of legislating for the benefit of Canada, should turn around and reduce the tariff, thus further disrupting our industrial situation and ruining the home market of the farmer. An hon. gentleman to my left said the other day that the home market was not much good, and would not be for another fifty years. What market, I wonder, does he think he is going to get under reciprocity? Why, with reciprocity—and you have had reciprocity with the Americans—they handle your goods just as long as it pays them to do so, that is, so long as there is a ready sale for them and it merely adds to their exporting surplus and so puts them in a better position to control world trade. It is only when you have a staggered, bleeding and exhausted Europe, unable to buy goods that the United States will refuse your business. What difference has the Fordney tariff made to the price of wheat to anybody? How much higher is the price of wheat today in the United States? Why, the fact is that reciprocity has nothing to do with the price. You all know now that the price of wheat is governed by the Liverpool market. Under reciprocity you give them the business to carry over for you and let them make the profits on mill feed and everything else to the detriment of your dairy herds, or you do it yourself at a time when both you and the Americans can sell.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

But at a time when both have a difficulty in selling, reciprocity or no reciprocity, you will be left just where you were. There are some commodities which can only be marketed at home; practically the whole of the dairy market is domestic. One of the difficulties encountered by agriculture to-day is the collapse of the home market as the result of the lack of buying power and lack of employment; yet some gentlemen think that if you make that condition worse, if you further impoverish the country, you will gain something. Reciprocity with a country which is the ultimate consumer of your products is a splendid thing; reciprocity with a competitor in business very much bigger than yourself is a very dangerous thing.

Reciprocity is not a new thing. We had a reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. My impression is that it was designed to run a specific time, but whether or not that is the fact is not of importance. Our total exports grew during that period from \$7,000,000 to \$49,000,000. The results were fully felt in the national trade of the year 1868, when our total exports fell to \$27,000,000. The reciprocity proposed in more recent years was something which could be abrogated at any time; there was no obligation to maintain it. In view of the one thing which made reciprocity desirable to the American people—the profits in the handling of our goods—and in view of the subsequent collapse of the buying markets of the world, no one can honestly think that reciprocity would have stood up for two minutes against the farmers' bloc in the United States, who are now getting what they want in the way of concessions.

I am honestly and genuinely interested, Mr. Speaker, in such an arrangement of the tariff of this country as will help the people of Canada rather than the American exporter. We have a tremendous amount of unemployment and the solution of that problem ought to be the chief concern of our public men. Many of our artisans, good workmen, men entitled to a job, are out of work, and we are still importing in excessive quantities things that these men could make and ought to have the opportunity to make. It is true that as the result of a campaign carried on last year, the carnival of outside buying has diminished. What are we to say to the workers of this country when the fact is that during the past five years our purchases from the United States have been \$1,700,000,000 in excess of our sales to