

United States imported, per capita, \$11.77; in the year 1879-80 she imported per capita \$12.57; in the year 1889-90 \$12.28, in the year 1900-1 she imported per capita \$10.23. Then, during the war, every one got extravagant; every nation was spending lavishly, and the great United States, in the year 1920, as against \$10.23 imported in 1901, imported at the rate of \$47.22 per capita. At the sight of this that great financial colossus becomes alarmed and you have the Fordney Bill.

Mr. CRERAR: Is not that due to the fact that the prices of goods have doubled, and in some cases trebled?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The importation has increased four times; but if my hon. friend waits, I think he will agree that the prices have not had so much to do with it.

Mr. CRERAR: They certainly have.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not care if the prices have increased. I am saying that the financial giant of the world became alarmed at an importation per capita of \$47.22, and immediately introduced the Fordney tariff. Yet the people of Canada, in the year 1920-21, bought at the rate of \$145.90 per capita. Mr. Speaker, are we not buying enough? Surely any one who knows the facts will admit that we are. What is the effect of the Fordney tariff upon us? My hon. friend refers to prices. Well, that is of importance, although prices had begun to drop. I have not these figures brought down to date because I have been out of the Finance Department for some time, but for the first four months of this fiscal year as compared with the same four months of last year, or on the one hand with the Fordney tariff in operation and on the other hand before it went into operation, we have the following figures on farm products, such as butter and its substitutes, cheese and its substitutes, meats (fresh or frozen), meats (prepared), potatoes, cattle, sheep, wheat flour and semolina, wool and milk (preserved or condensed), for the four months without the Fordney tariff our exports to the United States amounted to \$33,546,000; with the Fordney tariff in operation they dropped to \$10,070,000.

What about their exports to us? Always it has seemed to me most absurd that we have such large importations of agricultural commodities into an agricultural country. My figures there I have had put into quantities because you cannot get a

comparison as well with prices. In butter, cheese, mutton and lamb, pork (fresh), bacon and ham, canned meats, potatoes, tomatoes, grapes, pears, peaches, eggs and honey, our importations in 1920, before the Fordney tariff was adopted, amounted in quantities to 27,499,000; with the Fordney tariff in operation our importations amounted to 45,124,000 in the like quantity of units. At a time when our sales to the United States dropped from \$33,500,000 to \$10,000,000, an enormous drop, we increased our purchases of these American agricultural commodities by 63 per cent. And yet some gentlemen think the tariff ought to be left just as it is!

And on this question of agricultural imports the burden thrown on the United States was not very great after all. I read from their Agricultural Staples Report on the tariff, Series No. 20:

During the four months July to October, 1920, inclusive, imports of wheat amounted to 12,109,217 bushels, valued at \$28,146,296; and of flour to 222,002 barrels, valued at \$2,535,182. Substantially all of these shipments came from Canada, and were shipped during the latter part of September and in October.

To show what a comparatively small part that plays in the American market, let me complete the quotation:

During the same four months the exports of wheat from the United States amounted to 117,981,296 bushels, or \$339,278,520, and of flour to 6,055,829 barrels, valued at \$70,144,803.

In other words, they exported \$70,000,000 worth of flour in that period while they imported from us \$2,500,000—a negligible proportion of their export business; and in wheat they exported \$339,000,000 worth while we sent them \$28,000,000—less than a tenth, and yet we have all this fuss and trouble about it.

One or two opinions I ought to refer to, Mr. Speaker, expressing the American standpoint on the tariff. On October 20th, Congressman John W. Summers announced that he was framing a bill for a tariff on imported wheat, with particular reference to Canada, which he expected to introduce in Congress at the opening day of the next session in December. He did not specify the tariff decided upon, but said it would be a "good stiff duty."

The New York Evening Journal of November 3rd had the following to say on the subject:

During the first two weeks of October, Canadians sent five million bushels of wheat into the United States, competing directly, of course, with American farmers. Rather a nice situa-