

permitted to continue during times of stress. British anthracite is being landed at cost of around \$8 per ton, while it costs \$12 to land a ton of American anthracite, yet the consumer is being charged \$18 per ton for British anthracite while he pays only \$14 or \$15 per ton for American. When I hear these lamentations about trade with Russia my candid opinion is that I wish there was more of it—and remember, we have lots of wheat.

Mention has been made of cartels, combinations and trusts, but this is the same aluminum company which appeared before the tariff board set up under the Liberal regime and asked that a tariff be imposed upon aluminum goods coming into Canada from their own company in the States. Why was that done? So that they could further exploit the people of this country. That is what has happened and will happen again under the protection given to our industrialists. More will be exacted from the people; more profits will be made, and the working man will be the last to be considered.

There are one or two matters upon which I should like to touch regarding the agreements but, as I say, it would have been better had the items been considered first so that we could have had explanations of many of them. The first matter to which I shall refer is the cattle embargo. I am glad that this embargo has been lifted, but this thought goes through my mind: What would have happened if there had not been trouble between the Irish Free State and Great Britain? The delegates from the Irish Free State were here to tell the people of Canada that that market was there. In passing, may I say it seems strange that we get the worst of it in our agreement with the Irish Free State. We permit the goods from that country to enter Canada under the British preferential rate while our goods are to be subject to the lowest tariff. At the present time the lowest tariff on agricultural products is prohibitive. The lowest tariff on barley is seven shillings per hundredweight, and on oats, five shillings—two of our principal commodities.

I paid a great deal of attention this afternoon to the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir), and I noticed that he took up considerable time criticising, or lambasting, as I should say, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). The minister never delivers a speech, either inside or outside of the house, without making these two gentlemen the objects of his tirades. He stated that there were just three uses for wheat—to supply human needs, for seeding purposes, and for the feeding of

live stock. What then is the cause of the present low price of wheat? Last year the dumping of wheat by Russia was given as the cause of the low price, but no one has mentioned the dumping of wheat by Germany, which is purchasing considerable wheat from Canada and dumping her own wheat into Great Britain because her own producers or farmers receive a bonus on their exports of wheat. The minister has mentioned three uses for wheat, but I am giving another—it can be bought up by one country in order that it may export its own wheat and so receive a bonus.

Nothing was done at the conference with regard to price levels. This matter of great importance should have been dealt with. If at all possible there should be one unit of value. Mr. Moore says:

The British delegates felt that Canada was responsible for wrecking the London conference of 1930 and that this dominion had acted unfairly in raising the duties against Britain before going to the bargaining table that year and offering, as a great favour, to take them off again,—or a part of them. Also, they knew that—

This is very important as bearing on this matter.

—Canada alone among the countries of the world made regulations to ensure that Britain should obtain no trading advantage from the decline of the value of her currency. And they found at the conference that Canada was disposed to give little and demand much.

Above all others, the question of a unit of value should have been discussed. If there is going to be an equality of trade there should be a unit of value acceptable alike to all countries in the empire.

There are many of the agricultural items about which I am in doubt, but I should like to refer particularly to honey and prepared milk products. I notice that nothing has been said in the Canadian agreement about the entry of honey or prepared milk, if we except condensed milk. In the Australian and New Zealand agreements honey, prepared milk and condensed sweetened milk are mentioned, but in the United Kingdom-Canada agreement, while we have sweetened condensed milk no mention is made either of honey or of other prepared milks. This is significant, and when the time comes the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) may give us an explanation. I have in mind the three large combines which control the sweetened condensed milk trade of this country. I am just wondering whether something has not been put over our farmers' associations who have milk powder and evaporated milk to dispose of; because to me it is significant that those two articles are left out. If, as the Prime