

export market. Tariffs will not do it, and we have already a confession to that effect.

My right hon. friend started to blast a way into the markets of the world for the wheat growers but he has admitted that blasting is no good and he is trying another policy. We cannot understand that policy but I presume it will be explained when the statute is brought down. We have a five cent piece—by the way, that is being adopted now on the other side—which is being contributed—

Mr. CHAPLIN: You said you would not give a five cent piece.

Mr. RALSTON: My right hon. friend is not going to "give" it; the words in his budget are to the effect that the five cent piece is going to be "absorbed" in connection with the freight rate. That indicates that my right hon. friend has realized that tariffs will not bring about the desired effect as far as export is concerned. Dumping will not do it so far as export trade is concerned. I know of no country—my right hon. friend rather professed the other day to know of one—that can buy our products when they cannot sell their own. My right hon. friend must realize that, and he is realizing it now in connection with some of his foreign trade experiments. I ask him now: Where is there a country which can take any large portion of our products and which has only products to sell which do not compete in any way with ours? That country does not exist. In making a tariff my right hon. friend is always balancing the interest of our manufacturers, having regard to the fact that there may be some competition with our industries in view of the necessity for selling our goods overseas. Our industries must consider whether it is better to have possibly limited competition and at the same time to have our producers in a position to buy our own manufactures or whether it is better to have a complete monopoly of what we call our home market and have our producers without any money. My right hon. friend will have to face this problem very soon in connection with the trade treaties which he is talking about.

It seems to me that my right hon. friend is in this difficult position; he does not realize that there are other industries besides factories and places which have chimneys from which smoke comes or where wheels turn. He seems to have the idea that that is the only industry there is and he forgets entirely the great primary industries of this country such as farming, fishing, mining and lumbering which receive very little benefit

from tariffs. We do not discount the fact that the home markets are desirable, but if in order to monopolize the home market we make it impossible to carry on export trade, then the home market is useless because our people who depend on foreign trade for existence will have nothing with which to buy.

I will illustrate this by a reference to statistics, taken from my right hon. friend's speech, and which have reference to the very period to which he referred. These statistics indicate how dependent exports are upon imports. At the last session my right hon. friend put up a tariff barrier amounting practically to an embargo which he thought would keep our goods within this country, which would keep the home market for ourselves and at the same time, by some magic, would leave us free to sell abroad our goods which needed to be sold. The figures which I intend to quote will be found at pages 2332 and 2333 of Hansard. The total imports for 1930 amounted to \$1,248,273,582, while for 1931 they amounted to \$906,612,681, a difference of \$341,660,901. There was a falling off in imports, so his tariff succeeded in doing something. The total exports for 1930 amounted to \$1,144,938,070 and for 1931 to \$817,003,048, a decline of \$327,935,022. The imports declined 27·3 per cent while the exports declined 29·5 per cent. Take the United States, whose goods the right hon. gentleman has been endeavouring to keep out. The figures show that in 1931 the imports amounted to \$584,000,000, as compared to \$847,000,000 for the year, making a decline of \$263,000,000. Exports for 1931 to the United States were \$364,000,000, and for 1930, \$536,000,000—a falling off of \$172,000,000. Therefore, while imports from the United States fell off 31·05 per cent, exports fell off 32·09 per cent. In the case of empire trade, in 1931 our imports were reduced by 19·5 per cent, and our exports by 22·5 per cent. For the first four months of this year, our total imports have been reduced 34 per cent while the exports have been reduced 37 per cent.

I would point out to my right hon. friend that these figures show that the tariff policy which he has perpetuated in his budget is a failure and while it restricts imports it is doing greater damage to our exports. I should not have to prove that statement.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the change in the value of our exports?

Mr. RALSTON: We use the same dollars to value exports as we do to value imports. My right hon. friend does not need to have that proved to him because he had the same belief two or three years ago. In speaking