

easy to argue questions of theory in regard to such matters, but we have in this particular case the practical experience of the operation of the treaty which has now been in existence for a period of fifty-three months. To the end of February last was fifty-three months from the date of coming into force of the Australian treaty. I have here the figures which indicate in a practical way the results of that treaty so far as trade is concerned. I find that during the period in which the treaty has been in force we have sold to Australia, \$77,000,000 worth of goods and Australia has sold to us \$20,900,000 worth; in other words, in fifty-three months of operation of the treaty, Canada has sold to Australia, \$56,000,000 worth of goods more than Australia has sold to Canada. That is to say, month by month we have sold \$1,000,000 worth of goods more to Australia than Australia has sold to us. That is the practical result of the treaty as a whole, and I may say frankly to my hon. friends in the corner who desire the abrogation of the treaty that the government is not prepared to give any encouragement at all either in this house or in the country to the idea that parliament favours the abrogation of the treaty.

The Australian treaty, as was indicated in the addresses to which we have listened in this debate, was negotiated by my predecessor in office. Every treaty, of course, is subject to criticism. It is subject to criticism for the reason that in order to arrange a treaty to sell our goods, we must also be willing to consider buying goods from the same country, and it is not possible, as my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) argued, to reach that perfect position where we can always export those things which the other country does not produce and always import those things which we do not produce. That is a counsel of perfection which never has been attained in any trade treaty negotiations with any country in the world so far as I am aware. We may endeavour to approach it as near as we can, and it is in that regard a counsel of perfection.

Mr. STEVENS: That is all I suggested, of course.

Mr. DUNNING: The Australian treaty was extended to New Zealand by order in council. I do not wish to get out of order, Mr. Speaker, by traversing the ground of a previous debate, but it is in order, I believe, for me to give figures respecting the operation of the Australian treaty as a whole, as respects not only Australia, but Australia and New Zealand combined. I find that we have exported to New Zealand during the fifty-

three months of operation of the Australian treaty \$69,000,000 worth of goods, and that we have purchased from New Zealand \$40,000,000 worth, but as I indicated in a previous debate the government of Canada and the government of New Zealand are prepared to endeavour to work out a direct treaty as between Canada and New Zealand.

With respect to the Australian treaty, numerous interests in Canada representing industries other than those which specifically benefit under the treaty have on various occasions approached my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) with a view to opening negotiations with Australia for the extension of Canadian trade in those particular products. The Department of Trade and Commerce exists primarily for the extension of Canadian trade, and through the medium of the organization directed by that department every effort is constantly being made to extend Canadian trade not only with Australia but with all parts of the world. Notable success has been met with in the case of Australia, for during the past twelve months there has been a marked improvement in the shipment of Canadian lumber to Australia and New Zealand, an improvement which we hope and believe can be augmented in the years to come. We do not propose in connection with Australia or in connection with New Zealand to intimate either to Australia or to New Zealand that we do not want to trade with them. We do not propose that any indication shall go out to Australia, through the press or otherwise, that the Canadian parliament desires to abrogate the Australian treaty. We might conceivably be able to negotiate something better, but we are not taking the position that we desire to abrogate this treaty. With such a balance of trade in our favour as I have indicated, no government could possibly, in the interests of its own people, indicate a desire to terminate an arrangement which has worked out so satisfactorily for its own people.

Now I come to the Conservative subamendment. It is very skilfully worded, worded, of course, having in mind the known policy of the government in relation to matters of this kind, but quite contrary, may I suggest, to many of the speeches from Conservative members to which we have listened in this house in past sessions, and certainly quite contrary to the propaganda which has been spread from one end of Canada to the other, outside of British Columbia, by the Conservative party with respect to the Australian treaty. As my hon. friend from Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) said last night, the financial critic of the opposition, the hon. member for South