

trade. He gives no reason, and I cannot see why it should be so. Let me give some reasons for my belief that the very opposite would be the effect. A great many articles of farm produce common to both Canada and the United States are mentioned in the reciprocity agreement. Now, if we sell more of those things to the United States than we buy from them and we increase the trade in those things, the increased trade will probably be in about the same ratio. Let me illustrate by mentioning a few of the things that the farmers of Canada produce which are being sold in the United States. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, we imported of live animals from the United States, including animals for the improvement of stock and all imports under this head, \$2,419,004 worth, and we exported similar stock to the value of \$47,717,623. Therefore, we should put no obstacle in the way of our trade with the United States in live animals. If this proposal is not accepted and something in the nature of the Fordney Bill is put into effect, our market for live animals in the United States will practically be done away with. We imported from the United States grain of different kinds, leaving out corn, to the value of \$2,691,000, while we exported over \$20,000,000 worth. Of hay we imported \$538,000 worth and exported \$3,675,000 worth. Of potatoes we imported a little over \$8,000 worth and exported \$6,819,000 worth. Of milk and dairy products the value of the imports was \$852,000 and of the exports \$11,201,000; of fish, imports, \$1,689,000, and of exports \$17,417,000. Surely, therefore, it would be of some benefit to us to increase this trade, and the acceptance of the reciprocity offer would have the effect of increasing our exports generally—at least, of increasing the proportion which exports bear to imports. If it is a serious thing to have an adverse balance of trade, hon. gentlemen on the other side should jump at this opportunity, if they are sincere in their professions.

I wish to say a word or two in regard to an argument advanced in the first place by the Minister of Finance and since taken up by some others, that is, that if the reciprocity pact goes into effect there will be an increase in the duty on some few agricultural implements. It is true that the arrangement made between Canada and the United States did not fix the duties suggested as maximum duties. But I think no one will imagine for a moment that if the United States wished to reduce the duties

on any of the articles mentioned in the reciprocity agreement, we would object. Would the people of the United States object if we reduced the duties or left them where they are now? Would they object if we insisted on a reduction of the duty on binders from fifteen to twelve and one-half per cent? The idea is absurd. The contention of the member for Brome is correct from a legal standpoint; and I think hon. gentlemen opposite who are lawyers will agree that these were intended to be maximum duties. The member for Brome has given proof of that. When the United States Congress brought in legislation to carry out the reciprocity agreement they interpreted it as establishing these as maximum duties. Therefore, we must assume that the United States government or legislature were absolutely correct in their interpretation of that clause, and they interpreted that as a maximum. But even if it were not so, what great harm would result? We would, it is true, pay two and a half per cent more duty on our binders and mowers—those are the most important things—but we would have some implements at a little lower rate of duty and others at a little higher rate, so that there would be very little difference. What difference would there be in comparison with the tremendous gain we would make in the United States market with our cattle, hogs, sheep and wheat? My hon. friend refers to hogs. It is quite true that the price of hogs is sometimes quoted at a lower rate in the United States than in Canada. But will my hon. friend say for one moment that the quality of hogs in the United States is equal to the quality of hogs in Canada? Will he say that the quality of bacon in the United States is the same as the quality of bacon in Canada? He will not; he knows that he dare not compare the average quality of hogs sold in the United States with that of those sold in Canada.

I do not know whether it was he who said that in certain cases lately the price of grain in the United States was lower than in Canada. Of course, it is lower, and why? It is lower because the American dollar is worth more than the Canadian dollar. If barley is quoted to-day at 86 cents in the United States and at \$1 in Canada, which is the higher price? Will my hon. friend tell me that? Supposing there is a fourteen per cent discount on Canadian money, is not the eighty-six cents in the United States actually the same price as one dollar in Canada? My hon. friend ignores that altogether; it