

their products into our market. The Australian government of that day must have felt they were dealing with amateurs in diplomacy when they met our ministers, for the Australian people knew absolutely that this trade treaty would not be in the interests of Canadian agriculture. Their Minister of Trade and Commerce said so. He apparently had a better conception of what the treaty would mean to Canadian agriculture than our Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) for what did he say? I am quoting now from the speech which the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) made in this debate only a few days ago. The Australian Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Pratten, said:

The problem was to arrive at a result which would achieve the main objects of the negotiation, namely, a wider market for our primary products with a minimum of disadvantage to our secondary industries. The utmost care has been exercised to attain the result, and I feel sure that a careful examination of the proposals will prove that it has been attained.

Further on Mr. Pratten said:

We can readily imagine that the concessions proposed by Canada on primary products, of which she is a large producer, will lead to criticism by representatives of Canadian primary producers on the ground that their interests are being sacrificed to Canada's need for markets for manufactured goods.

Evidently the Minister of Trade and Commerce for Australia sized up the situation and foresaw what the results would be in Canada. He felt, as the members of this House felt, that agriculture in Canada was being sacrificed in the interests of industry. This man, thousands of miles away, was able to size up the situation better even than our Minister of Finance, who, speaking of the Australian treaty, said in this House on June 22, 1925:

We do not claim that this is going to be of any material advantage to agriculture, but we do claim that it will not injure agriculture.

That is the position the Minister of Finance took. He felt that the treaty was not in the interests of agriculture, but he was willing to take the risk of injuring agriculture in Canada to see how the treaty would work out.

Another point I wish to take up is in connection with the extension of the Australian treaty to New Zealand. Twice before the question has been asked in this House as to the extension of the Australian treaty to New Zealand, but no answer has been elicited from the government. An order in council was passed on September 26, 1925, and the question was asked in the House whether by that order in council the same concessions given to Australia were being extended to New Zealand, and if New Zealand was giving to Canada the same concessions that Australia

[Mr. R. K. Anderson.]

was giving. The hon. member for South Oxford asked:

What concessions were received from New Zealand by extending to that country the same treaty that was extended to Australia, and what pressure was brought to bear by New Zealand to secure the advantages Australia had received?

That question was asked of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) who replied:

I will answer that very shortly. I do not know all the details, but I know that we are all in the one family.

But he did not come back to the question, and he gave no answer to it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Excuse me. That was the end of my remarks, and I did not want to open up the question again.

Mr. ANDERSON: The hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Davis) also raised the same question. He said:

According to the order that has been passed in council, we as a Canadian people do not enjoy the same privileges and rights in connection with this treaty as we do in connection with the treaty with Australia. The order in council provides that our markets can be used for the shipment of Australian products for which we receive no consideration whatever. Therefore I say that if we have a government which is willing to open up our markets, under conditions which this order in council provides, for the products of other countries in competition with our own products without receiving any consideration whatever, it is the duty of this parliament to deal with the situation. If any minister to-day is of the opinion that I have made in this House an assertion that is not correct, I will give him a few moments to take an opportunity of correcting it.

No answer was forthcoming from the members of the government, and several of them were in their seats. That question has not been answered yet, and it is an important question, and should be cleared up. Has New Zealand given us any concessions in return for the concessions that have been extended to her, or was the order in council just a blank order allowing New Zealand products to come into our market without our receiving in return any concessions whatever? This House and the country are entitled to an answer to that question, and I think the members of the government who are now in the House should make some attempt to deal with it.

As regards the trade of Australia and New Zealand, if we look at those two countries combined, in order to see if they can compete in the Canadian market, we find that the combined area of Australia and New Zealand is almost equal to that of Canada—3,078,443 square miles. The combined population of those two countries in 1921 was 6,654,000, while that of Canada in the same year was 8,778,000. In 1923, the combined foreign trade of