

worst of the deal. I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to cast his eye over his own returns, over the first public document that he has issued to the people of Canada. On the front page it says, "Issued under the authority of the Hon. James Malcolm, M.P." I ask him to cast his eye over his own trade returns and see if he does not agree with me in the statement I made, that in every single trade agreement the King government has negotiated, Canada has got the worst of the arrangement.

Take the results of the trade treaty negotiated with France, as set out on page 2 of the trade returns. In the first year of the operation of that treaty, we exported to France \$15,817,000 worth of goods. In the last twelve months our exports fell to \$14,071,000. We were promised a great export business with France as a result of that treaty. We were to be given most favoured treatment by France, but our trade with France, instead of increasing, has gone back in three years by over one million dollars in spite of all our efforts. We opened our markets to France, but their exports to us have not gone back. During the first year of that treaty they exported to Canada \$17,682,000 worth of goods, and that \$17,000,000 odd has grown in the last twelve months to \$21,787,000. Our exports to France have decreased, while our imports from France have materially increased.

Take the treaty with Italy. During the first year of the operation of the Italian treaty, our exports to Italy amounted to \$17,215,000 worth of goods. In the last twelve months they fell back to \$15,911,000, a drop of \$2,000,000 in our exports to Italy since the treaty came into operation. But Italy has taken advantage of our market and of the favourable terms which we granted, because while in the first year of the treaty she sold us only \$1,800,000 worth of goods, last year the figures had grown to \$3,124,000. What is the result? Our exports to Italy, under the operation of the treaty, have fallen off, while their exports to us, our imports of Italian products, have largely increased.

Let us take the Australian trade agreement, which is also mentioned on page 2 of the trade returns. In the year before that treaty went into operation, in 1924, we sold to Australia \$14,482,000 worth of goods. Last year our sales had increased to \$17,848,000, an increase of about 25 per cent. How about our imports? Before the Australian treaty went into effect we imported from Australia \$1,183,000 worth of goods. Our imports have risen now to \$4,339,000 worth of goods or an increase in our imports of 400 per cent, while the

increase in our exports to Australia amounts to about 25 per cent. It is from Australia and New Zealand that the butter comes, and they have increased their trade to Canada materially, while we have had only a very, very negligible increase in our exports to Australia; and so it is with New Zealand. Before the treaty, New Zealand sent to Canada \$1,560,000 worth of goods. Last year the figures jumped to \$3,856,000, an increase of 260 per cent in the shipment of their agricultural products into this country. Our exports to New Zealand before the treaty were \$13,676,000. Last year these had grown to \$15,897,000, or an increase of about 20 per cent. The trade is all going one way as between Canada and Australia and New Zealand. They are taking advantage of our open market and filling this country with Australian and New Zealand farm products, while we, who are getting some slight advantage in their market, are increasing to a minor extent only our sales of paper, pulp products and the like.

Now, how can we justify such a situation? My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has always been considered in the province of Ontario an outstanding supporter of protection. He is now sitting side by side in the cabinet with my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke), an outstanding disciple of the policy of free trade. Together they sit at the cabinet council, cheek by jowl, sworn to bear confidence and respect for each other, sworn to stand and act together, to be responsible each for the actions of the other. There they sit side by side, an out-and-out free trader and an out-and-out protectionist. I said a moment ago that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was one of the most successful manufacturers of the province of Ontario, and I ask him why. His is one of the few industries in the province of Ontario that enjoys to-day, and always has enjoyed, 30 per cent protection. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not for one moment say that his protection is too high. I go so far as to say that if, upon investigation it is shown that he is not sufficiently protected, he ought to be further protected. On looking at the trade returns, it would appear to me that he has at present sufficient protection for his industry, for out of the millions and millions of dollars worth of furniture used and consumed in this country each year, his own trade return shows that in the last twelve months only one and a half million dollars' worth of furniture was imported from all the world into Canada; so I assume from those figures that he has adequate and proper protection for his industry. Now does my hon. friend from Bran-