this is admitted by any student of our history —that at any time since confederation when the imports of the country have been greatest unemployment has always been at its lowest level. And the figures I have given very definitely and clearly bear that out.

The right hon. gentleman went on to say:

> We had to make a new treaty with New Zealand, and that treaty has brought about increased trade and has added wealth to both countries.

That statement is true and is worthy of note. We did make a new treaty with New Zealand and that treaty has brought about increased trade and added to the wealth of both countries. He says that the same thing may be true of other countries. That is exactly what does take place. Before we went out of power we had a trade with New Zealand of $35,000,000, $19,000,000 of which we exported to that country, importing from them $16,000,000. But after the policy of my hon. friends opposite had been in force for a short time, that trade was cut seven ways; less than one-seventh of it remained between the two countries. It was less than $5,000,000. The right hon. gentleman said that his government negotiated a new treaty with New Zealand, and I think we were all glad to see that happen. He also said, with regard to this so called excise tax of three per cent which is actually an additional tariff of three per cent, that as far as Great Britain was concerned one and a half per cent had been removed one year and the other one and a half per cent the following year. He went on to say that the previous government made a treaty with France, gave the intermediate tariff to Germany and Austria, and made treaties with Brazil and Poland. The result has been reflected in the figures I have just quoted; in 1933 our total trade was only approximately $887,000,000, while in 1935 it increased to about $1,189,000,000. So apparently hon. gentlemen opposite, who were in power for five years, found that their policies had to be reversed or conditions in this country would not improve.

I have before me some facts with regard to the customs duties paid on goods entering Canada from Great Britain. I could put a great many figures on Hansard, but I have not time for that to-day. On raincoats and trousers suitable for farm wear, coming into this country from Great Britain, the duty was over 55 per cent. On ties coming into Canada from Ireland there was a duty of over 45 per cent. On men's hosiery, both woollen and fine, coming from Great Britain, the customs taxes of one kind or another totalled over 64 per cent. On sweaters and hose used by workmen the actual duty paid was over 69 per cent.

And yet at one time the right hon. leader of the opposition said:

> For we must commonly agree that there can be no continued sale without purchase; that if we expect to market our goods in the United Kingdom we must expect to purchase goods from the United Kingdom.

I should like to say that a great deal of relief has been afforded by this United States trade agreement. I see on the floor of this chamber a carpet. I have in my hand a bill to which a customs bill is attached, dealing with a carpet imported into Canada from the United States very recently, but before the trade agreement was concluded. The carpet cost $50.07 in the United States, and I find that the total customs duty amounted to $70.06, the sales tax to $7.26 and the excise tax to $3.63, or a grand total of $80.95 on an article costing $50.07 in the United States. If we eliminate the sales tax, though it should not be entirely eliminated, this means that the duty on this carpet amounted to $73.69, or a tariff of over 145 per cent. Even to-day, under the intermediate tariff, we are still paying more than 100 per cent on carpets coming in from the United States.

At this point I should like to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) upon reducing the duties on textiles coming into Canada. In my judgment one of the features of the budget worthy of special attention is what has been done in the interests of Canadian consumers in that regard. I have not as yet had time to analyze the changes which are proposed; perhaps I am not capable of analyzing them fully, but as I understand it I think this is a great step in the right direction. Let me say, however, that the figures which I have presented to the house to-day show that we have yet a long distance to go before the tariffs are down to where they should be.

In our part of the country, Mr. Speaker, we cannot benefit by tariffs. We sell on a free trade market, and unless in some way we can first get the opportunity to sell and then be permitted to purchase at reasonable prices we cannot continue to exist. Professor Rogers of Queens university, now our very able Minister of Labour, in his leisure moments figured out that the tariff costs the province of Saskatchewan approximately $26,000,000 annually. To-day in this house we hear men say that certain bonuses, subsidies and all that sort of thing have been given to Saskatchewan recently, and that may be true. I am not one of those who believe in subsidies but I say that under the present set-up it may be necessary to continue that practice although the principle is not sound. We