

behalf of the Newfoundland government. When the United States therefore made these concessions, we suppose that, while Canada was recognized as the principal supplier at the moment of both of these items, they also took into account the fact that Newfoundland had a special interest in the high moisture content. When they made a concession on one of the items they always felt that they had to make the concession on both of the items, and make an equal concession on both of the items, rather than to introduce a difference or change the difference from that which had existed already. As I mentioned yesterday in my general remarks, the United States negotiators appeared throughout not to be anxious to do anything that would savour of a discrimination among the countries with which they were dealing. It would have been very difficult for them to make a concession on the item that was of greater interest to the one country without making the concession at the same time on the item that was of greater interest to the other country. That, however, is only speculation on my part. This is perhaps all that I can really say of my own knowledge with regard to what happened.

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: I would like to ask a question in that regard. That has brought up this point. When negotiations were carried on with the principal suppliers, was it permissible at Geneva for other countries which were interested in that product to sit in on those negotiations as well as the principal supplier?

Mr. KEMP: There were not in general three-cornered negotiations. There were in exceptional cases a few instances that we heard of where some other countries sat in. For example, when we negotiated some of the fish items with the United States we did have representatives from Newfoundland, and when they were negotiating fish items and fish oils we had representatives also. But while as a general thing a third party did not take part in the negotiations, there was nothing to prevent a third party from making a request on an item, even though not the principal supplier. We ourselves made many requests on items of which we were not the principal suppliers, in the hope that, even though we might not have as much influence as the principal supplier, they might nevertheless be willing to pay some attention to our attitude in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: And did they?

Mr. KEMP: We think that in some cases they did.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: On that question of moisture content, I am advised that from our point of view in Nova Scotia, it would be desirable to have that differential removed, or failing that, the percentage increased. Is that 43 per cent provision more or less a fixed part of the American tariff?

Mr. KEMP: Yes. They did not change the wording of tariff items at Geneva. They could take a tariff item and break it up into different parts, but they could not, for example, have changed the 43 per cent to 40 per cent or 50 per cent, if it would have the effect of changing any duty by more than 50 per cent.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Would that be a point on which, in any future negotiations, it might be possible to reflect the specific viewpoint of the Canadian exporter, either by having the tariff items the same or, failing that—and I am advised that from our point of view this would be desirable and necessary—by having the percentage increased?

Mr. KEMP: During the recent negotiations the powers of the negotiators were those, of course, laid down in their Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. But if in some future negotiations they were to operate under some different authorization, as for example, if they were to operate under the direct authority of Congress, it would then be possible for them to work on a different plan.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: For instance, the other day in the House of Commons a minister intimated that further negotiations were in progress. Are they