

succeeding 1932 the prices of our leading varieties were lower by several shillings a barrel than for the five previous years. I made a very careful study of that situation. They might, and probably would, have been lower still, had it not been for the preference, but it is utterly impossible to trace the effect of that particular kind of duty in increased or decreased prices.

Mr. STIRLING: As the Minister of Trade and Commerce says, time will tell.

Mr. EULER: I was echoing what the leader of the opposition said.

Mr. MANION: Keep on; it is worth echoing.

Mr. ILSLEY: The apple interests of Nova Scotia attach some importance to the anti-dumping provision in the agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom by which the British reserve the right to impose dumping duties or take other corrective measures if dumping is resorted to by United States shippers to the United Kingdom. They also attach importance to the letter from the United States government by which the United States have recognized the principle of regulation of shipments and have agreed to call the attention of their industry to the desirability of such regulation. That letter appears in one of the annexes to the agreement. They know that our position in the Canadian market remains unaffected, and they are gratified by the reduction in duties and import taxes, which is provided for by the trade agreement, on some of their supplies, particularly on spraying and dusting materials and fertilizers, and upon agricultural implements, including spraying and other orcharding machinery from which the 3 per cent special excise tax is to be removed. It is for these reasons that the apple growing interests in Nova Scotia are satisfied that the present level of preference, which, after all, on a \$2.25 per barrel price basis is still over 40 per cent, when taken with the other provisions of the agreement will prove a help rather than an injury to the apple growing industry of that province.

But even if the situation were different, I am satisfied that my constituents would not be disposed to be so narrow as to regard this agreement purely as a matter of a few cents a barrel on apples.

Mr. SPENCE: The minister must have a wonderful country.

Mr. MICHAUD: It is.

Mr. ILSLEY: I must admit that they are perhaps a little in advance of myself in that

regard, and they are a long way in advance of the hon. member for Yale, if we are to take his speech of last Friday night as a true reflection of his feelings. When these trade agreements were first talked of, I found that they appreciated the situation with which this country and this government were confronted. They knew that when the United States and the United Kingdom started negotiations last year, this was a new and dramatic development in international trade. It appealed to their imagination, to the imagination of the people of Great Britain and the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ILSLEY: The Tory party cannot understand that. I knew that when I said that it would provoke a laugh from the opposition benches. But it is true, and true of the people of this country as a whole.

Mr. STIRLING: Such a happy truth!

Mr. ILSLEY: They realized that vital interests, fundamental principles and the future welfare of hundreds of millions of people were involved; they realized that Anglo-Saxon commerce was at the cross-roads. Would it take the way of rigid exclusionism or the way of mutual concession? And they were in favour of Canada adopting a policy of give and take, which they felt was the only policy for this country, as well as for the other two countries involved in the transaction, to adopt.

The people of my constituency, and I think the people of Canada as a whole, realized this, that in a day of totalitarian gibes and sneers at democracy, it was a matter of pride and satisfaction that great democracies could work together for great ends.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

POST OFFICE ACT

AMENDMENT PROHIBITING MAILING OF COMMUNISTIC LITERATURE

Mr. WILFRID LACROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) moved the second reading of Bill No. 4, to amend the Post Office Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I consider it advisable, before asking the house to prevent the distribution by mail of all communistic propaganda, to define my conception of communism and to endeavour to penetrate hon. members with the importance for this country of pre-