

These, it seems to me, are the main principles of the trade agreement. I do not know whether the opposition believe in them or not, but I think they will have to make up their minds. They have not told the house. The main feature of their attitude is one of rather gloomily predicting that time alone can tell. They do, however, say something else about the trade agreement. They say that it is an exchange of a certain market for an uncertain one. They say that we are losing a certain market in Great Britain and acquiring in lieu thereof an uncertain market in the United States. Neither one of these statements is correct. We are not losing, in any sense of the word, the British market, either partly or wholly; and we are not acquiring a market in the United States which under the circumstances is likely to be uncertain. It is said that if there is a change of government in the United States this agreement may be terminated and we may find our products once more excluded from that country. One of the surest safeguards against the cancellation of the Canada-United States trade agreement is the difference between the levels of our intermediate and general tariffs, which is a very great difference, and I am sure that no United States government will lightly consider the cancellation of an agreement with Canada which will subject their goods once more to the heavy disabilities of entry into this country under the general tariff. It is not reasonable that this would be the case. It may be that if their whole trading policy receives a new orientation at some future date, all their trade agreements will be cancelled; but I would point out that if that is the case, and if our trade agreement continues with Great Britain as we have every reason to expect that it will, the cancellation of the trade agreements as a whole will mean the restoration of our preferences in the British market—which will be a further deterrent to the cancellation of the trade agreements. So that I think we may expect a reasonable degree of certainty and stability to the arrangements that have been made under this trade agreement.

The next position taken by the opposition is that, whether this agreement is good in principle or not, we have paid too high a price for it. As the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling) said on Friday night, the question becomes wholly one of price. What is the price that we are said to have paid for the agreement? It is said that we have lowered some of our duties too far, and undoubtedly that will be argued by a great many of the opposition speakers. On that point I can only say that, for an agreement

[Mr. Ilsley.]

which extends to and affects so many thousands of products imported into this country, the volume of complaint which the government has received is very small indeed. Some industries are afraid that they will lose more than they will gain by the agreement. But that is not true of more than a very few. Canadian industry as a whole is not displeased with, but is rather in favour of, this agreement, as is evident by the expressions of opinion which one has heard and read since the agreement was announced in November. The interests of Canadian industries have been carefully safeguarded, and for the most part they are not injuriously affected in the smallest degree.

The position taken seems to be that tariff concessions by Canada are necessarily sacrifices by this country. That is not the case. Tariff concessions are not necessarily sacrifices. It does not follow that because the other country is helped, this country is hurt. The concessions may help this country even more than the country to which the concessions are made. I have in mind, for example, Indian corn. The duty is reduced by this agreement from twenty cents to ten cents a bushel on the corn which is used by persons feeding stock on farms. But I do not think there would be any opinion, certainly not very much, in this country that the reduction of the farmer's costs from twenty cents to ten cents a bushel on the corn he buys would be an injury to this country; on the contrary it would be a benefit.

The hon. member for Yale, speaking on Friday night, referred to fruits and vegetables. He said that this is the third blow which this government has struck the fruit and vegetable industry. I would point out that the interests of the fruit and vegetable growers have been very carefully safeguarded in this agreement. I have before me a list of the twenty-seven fruits and vegetables which are affected by the agreement, and I have here also a list of their assumed invoice values when imported—I am confident that they are entirely fair, and they have been used in this house before. I have a computation of the protection that will still be extended to these fruits and vegetables during the seasons and in the regions where the protection accorded by fixed valuations applies, and I find that the average of ad valorem equivalents is still 65 per cent, while a great many of the ad valorem equivalents run to much higher figures, two of them going to over 100 per cent. These reductions in the valuations were not lightly agreed to. Everything was taken into account. The tariff rate was reduced from 15 to 10 per cent, but that benefits the consumer in