

had risen to \$19.89. Mark this, from 1921 to 1930, the party opposite was in power—this low tariff party, the party which is going to reduce the tariff every time it comes into office, and the party which promises to remove oppressive taxation from the shoulders of the poor people of Canada. In 1930, after nine years of office they had reduced the per capita taxation, so far as the tariff is concerned, from \$19.89 to \$19.50. In other words they reduced the figure by 39 cents in ten years. That is some record! And mark this, while in 1930 the per capita tariff taxation was \$19.50, in 1931 after we had raised the ramparts of ruin it was \$14.37.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Trade went down.

Mr. FRASER (Cariboo): In 1932 it was further reduced to \$10.85; in 1933 to \$7.23 and in 1934 \$6.75.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Slipping all the time; trade going down.

Mr. FRASER (Cariboo): How does it sound? Then, another gem from the observations of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre; I mean his reference to the greatest example of tariff raising in our history. I have given the record—from \$19.50 down to \$6.75.

I am not through with the hon. gentleman. Let us turn to the average rate of duty, another very interesting study. I shall not go into many details, but shall be content to go back to the year 1921. In 1921 the average rate of duty on total imports stood at 14.1 per cent. In 1930, with a low tariff government in power it was 15.9 per cent. That indicates an increase of 1.8 per cent, if my mathematical calculation is correct. In 1931 it had gone up to 16.4 per cent, an increase of .5 per cent. In 1932 it went up to 19.7 per cent; in 1933 it went down to 19 per cent and in 1934 it stood at 16.9 per cent. The ramparts of ruin which we have raised around this country between the years 1930 and 1934 are, so far as rates of duty are concerned, exactly one per cent. The increase has been from 15.9 per cent to 16.9 per cent.

Another factor which has something to do with export and import trade, and a difficulty which this government tried to correct by way of the Ottawa agreements, is that of deflecting our excessive exports and imports—or, only imports, if you like—from the United States to a country more friendly to us in a trading way. In 1921 the percentage of total imports from the United Kingdom stood at 17.3 per cent. In 1931 the percentage had

been reduced to 16.5 per cent, and in 1934 as a result of the Ottawa agreements, and for no other reason, the proportion had increased to 24.2 per cent. Our exports too had increased. In 1921 we exported to the United Kingdom 26.3 per cent of our total exports, in 1931, 27.2 per cent and last year 39.3 per cent.

We have heard a great deal about the duty against imports from the United Kingdom and the excessive rates of duty we have levied on textiles particularly. The total rates of duty levied are as follows: In 1930 we imposed a rate of 20.5 per cent; in 1931 19.6 per cent, while in 1932 the rate was 20.5 per cent, an increase of a little more than one per cent. Then in 1933 the percentage decreased to 18.6, while last year it was back to 20.5. Notwithstanding all the hot air we have heard about the increase of duty on goods from the United Kingdom the fact is that we have reduced the rate by nine-tenths of one per cent on the total imports.

In all reasonableness why should the financial critic of the opposition say that the tariff policy of this government has been futile when that policy has been the means of increasing our trade? We are not substantially increasing restrictions on trade. If I understand the signs of the times we propose from time to time to reduce duties. We are not going around the country telling people that we are going to reduce them and then, upon taking office, failing to carry out our promises. We say before we take office, "We are going to impose a reasonable and a fair tariff," and when we take office we impose that reasonable and fair tariff.

I do not see why the financial critic should say that these tariff policies are futile when they are increasing our trade. They are improving the position not only of Canada but of the old country and they are hurting no person. Then we have the criticism that the Prime Minister did not blast his way into the markets of the world. The statement is made that he promised to make tariffs fight for Canada. I think he has been doing just that very thing; I do not know what else one could call it. If one were to study the situation and if he were to take the trade returns received from time to time he must conclude that for some reason or another from day to day the trade of Canada is increasing. Of course, being a good supporter of the government I say the government should receive the benefit for that increase in trade.

Mr. POULIOT: The Prime Minister was K.O'd in that prize fight, and he still thinks he is O.K.