

resolutions preceding the treaty and from a report in the press I notice that they are now on the second or third reading of the bill. I quote from a Canadian Press report of October 20 last:

By overwhelming majorities the House of Commons this evening passed a series of resolutions preparatory to ratifying the imperial trade agreements. . . .

The United Kingdom does not wish to stop trading with Russia, Mr. Baldwin said, but in the future Anglo-Russian trade must be on a more even balance than it has been in the past.

Crushing government majorities were recorded on the divisions on four financial resolutions which give legislative effect to tariff provisions inherent in the agreements concluded at the imperial conference. The majorities ranged between 350 and 400.

That is the businesslike way in which they are proceeding to pass these agreements at Westminster.

Right here I think I might well consider the main objections put forward by the right hon. leader of the opposition. He it was who put up the main barrage, and he made his greatest argument against the five year term of this agreement. Surely time should be the essence of this agreement as of all others, whether between individuals, governments, or nations. I claim that if the agriculturist of western Canada or any other part of this country is to avail himself of the real benefits that we believe will accrue under this agreement, he must have a chance to change his methods in order to increase his production to the point that will be necessary. It will mean an increase in the production of hogs, cattle, dairy products, lumber and many other items. This cannot be accomplished within a year or two, and I think that any term shorter than five years would be worthless. Any hon. member of this house who heard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens), or the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion), deal with this phase of the argument put forward by the leader of the opposition must acknowledge that they answered it fully, and particularly when the Minister of Trade and Commerce pointed out that the treaty with the West Indies was for a term of ten years. But I do not ask the house to take simply the arguments presented from this side. I am going to quote an imperial authority, Sir John Simon, a Liberal member of the national government in Great Britain, who speaking in favour of the five year term in the House of Commons on October 20th is reported as follows:

Sir John Simon, speaking in the House of Commons today in the debate on the Ottawa agreements referred especially to the constitutional point taken by Sir Herbert Samuel over [Mr. E. E. Perley.]

the five-year term in the Anglo-Canadian agreement.

Sir John declared he had consulted responsible permanent officials of both the Foreign office and the Board of Trade on the question, and had been informed that the five-year terms was no innovation. The practice for trade treaties to cover a minimum period of years after which they might be terminated by either side on given notice was an accepted one.

Sir John made particular point of the Anglo-French treaty of 1860 which was concluded by Cobden and approved by Gladstone. This treaty was for ten years and the opposition then raised the objection now raised by Sir Herbert Samuel, he declared. Both Cobden and Gladstone had swept the objection aside.

What better argument could we have than that in favour of the five year term?

I wish to give some figures to the house which will I think show the importance of the five year clause. They are taken from the 1930 report of the United States statistical branch, and given in dollars the value of the 1930 exports of the first ten primary products from the United States to Great Britain:

United States Exports to Great Britain, 1930

Products—	Value
Wheat..	\$23,000,000
Wheat flour..	8,500,000
Barley..	5,600,000
Pig products..	28,300,000
Lumber..	23,500,000
Leaf tobacco..	75,000,000
Lead..	650,000
Zinc..	300,000
Copper..	20,000,000
Apples..	10,300,000

That is a total of \$195,000,000 of primary products exported from the United States to Great Britain in that year. The figures do not include the exports of fish and dairy products, condensed milk, butter and cheese. If we add those to the figures I have just quoted it will be found that we are being given a preference in a market which the United States supplied to the amount of \$225,000,000 in the year 1930. Will it not then be generally agreed that it will take time for Canada to develop that market? There is this further fact. If we add the exports of wheat and beef from the Argentine, of wheat and lumber from Russia, of pig products from Poland and Denmark, the figures reach a total of some \$500,000,000, and we are being given a preference in that great market for our primary products—the products of the farm, of the forest and of the mine. The point I wish to make in that connection is that it would have been far better had the term of this agreement been made ten years instead of five.

I would also draw the attention of the leader of the opposition to this fact, that the strongest argument brought against the reci-