

I should like to speak very briefly respecting the question of trade arrangements with the United States. I submit any extended statement as to the negotiations for a trade treaty with the president and the executive of the United States would be neither advisable nor desirable at this particular juncture, when representations and briefs have just been filed with the United States authorities under the terms of their legislation and are now under consideration. But it will do no harm at this time to restate briefly the position of the Conservative party as outlined by the Prime Minister in his speech in the session of 1933, found at page 2261 of Hansard, where he reviews the whole position, beginning as far back as 1879 when the national policy was introduced into this country, and in which he traced the history of the movement, including the legislation of 1888, 1890 and 1894 under the old Conservative government, and the legislation of 1897 under the Laurier administration, and again in 1923; in all of which there were standing offers of reciprocal trade arrangements on the part of the parliament of Canada. In the face of all these offers the tariff of the United States was steadily raised against Canada, with the exception of a brief period during the democratic administration of President Wilson. During which time we enjoyed practically all the advantages of the proposed agreement of 1911. I would particularly call the attention of the house to the language of the Prime Minister at page 2267, in which he uses the following words:

We must concede the absolute right of the United States Congress to determine what it conceives to be best in the interests of that country. That is clear. In my judgment all we can do is follow the course that has been followed by successive governments and indicate clearly our willingness to negotiate on terms that are fair and reasonable, to quote the words that have been used by both Liberal and Conservative prime ministers and ministers of finance. We can only be ready and willing to avail ourselves of any proposals that are fair and reasonable and are not of such a character as will involve injury to this country if they are speedily terminated. I regard that as a factor of the utmost importance, and I believe I always shall, because I never have seen any answer to that argument, whether it be the notice that terminated that reciprocity agreement in 1864 or 1865, or the more recent termination of the Wilson tariff statute.

The negotiations are going on and in my opinion no good purpose will be served by continuing the discussion here.

Mr. JEAN FRANCOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the sub-amendment may I say that on February 3,

1933, as appearing at page 1805 of Hansard the following question was put to the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote):

Mr. Pouliot: If the tariff is lowered will there be any further necessity for inflation? If trade becomes normal will not our currency also return to normal?

Mr. Coote: The more tariffs we remove the sooner our money will return to its proper level.

The same matter was referred to on March 27, 1933, at page 3427 of Hansard, and the hon. member did not object to it. At page 4459 of the Hansard of May 1, 1933, the same matter was referred to by the member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), and the hon. member for Macleod spoke as follows:

I do not think my hon. friend has quoted me correctly. Although we might have free trade, I think this country has been deflated to such a point that we must have inflation to correct the situation. I was in error if I gave the answer which the hon. gentleman attributes to me.

But he had said, "The more tariffs we remove the sooner our money will return to its proper level." That is very clear, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not insist any more about it.

In his speech this afternoon the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Hanson) said that it was when the Liberal government was in power that Canada lost her markets. I have a few remarks to make on that same subject of markets but with this difference, that I shall submit that the time when Canada lost her markets was from 1930 until the present under this Conservative administration. The hon. minister was kind enough some time ago to give me some information about the proportion of the United Kingdom's trade with empire countries to total world trade for the calendar years 1929 to 1933, and I find there that the proportion is as follows:

Proportion of United Kingdom Trade with
Empire Countries of Total World Trade
(Calendar Years, 1929 to 1933)

Years	Imports		Exports		Total trade	
	%		%		%	
1929.. . . .	4.9		4.8		4.8	
1930.. . . .	5.1		4.6		4.8	
1931.. . . .	5.4		4.1		4.8	
1932.. . . .	6.2		4.5		5.4	
1933.. . . .	6.6		4.6		5.6	

I am not making any point about the percentage of imports and exports because they are about the same, but the figures in the above table that I wish to stress are those showing the United Kingdom's empire trade as a percentage of total world trade, namely, in 1930, 4.8 per cent; 1931, 4.8 per cent; 1932, 5.4 per cent, and 1933, 5.6 per cent. But that