

Australian Treaty—Mr. McRae

and to the Australian treaty in particular. As regards treaties in general, I presume we should consider them from a national viewpoint and in that connection we on the Pacific coast, separated as we are by the Rocky mountains from the other parts of the Dominion, sometimes feel that our interests have not always been well considered.

I have in mind the revision of the French treaty which, I think, was termed the convention of 1922. To the amazement of those interested in the production of salmon on our Pacific coast they found that when the schedules became public knowledge, the preference they received in the new convention was but one-half of that previously enjoyed on their shipments to France. So seriously did this affect their exports that it was with difficulty they were able to compete with United States shippers of canned salmon to France. If one reads the convention, it would appear that some mistake was made in putting canned salmon into the intermediate column instead of into the column providing for the minimum tariff. This apparently did not occur in regard to any other article at least in the fishery line. It was a disappointment to the fishing industry on the Pacific coast that under the new convention they should be deprived of one-half of their preference without having been consulted in the matter. It might well be a principle in the negotiation of our treaties in future that those interests which are going to be vitally affected should be consulted so that a proper presentation might be made with a view of at least maintaining the preference previously enjoyed. We have a large Dominion; there are many diversified interests; changes develop from time to time; important omissions are no doubt made in certain instances, and a revision of our treaties may frequently be in order. In any event we are not experienced in making treaties; we have many interests to harmonize, and certainly revisions need not be unexpected.

Referring to the Australian treaty, I was rather surprised when I came to look the matter up to find that notwithstanding all the discussions there have been with respect to that treaty, at the present time Canadian exports to Australia are but two and one-half per cent of the imports into that dominion. This clearly shows that in a revision there is hope for an extension of the business we are now doing with that sister dominion, and I trust later to be able to point out to the house some outstanding instances which, in the light of results, do not appear to have received sufficient consideration in the making of the previous treaty. I agree entirely with the principle

[Mr. McRae.]

enunciated by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre that treaties should apply to exchange of indigenous products.

Mr. DUNNING: What is that?

Mr. McRAE: We produce in this country certain commodities which we want to sell; Australia produces certain commodities which she wishes to sell, and the bargain is to effect an exchange of commodities which will be beneficial to both countries.

It happens that I was for some years interested in the principal lines of production on the Pacific coast. I refer to the products of the forest and the sea. Having divested myself, after entering the house, of any interests directly or indirectly in those industries, I think I am in a position to speak with a knowledge which may be interesting to the house. In the presentation I propose to make with regard to the products of the sea and the forests of British Columbia, and the possibilities of extension of trade in those great industries, there can be no charge of personal interest. There are in the schedule many items which will no doubt be discussed, but for my part I prefer to confine my remarks to the two industries which I understand.

We have heard a great deal about newsprint as connected with the Australian treaty, and I wish to state that the figures I shall quote are for the calendar year as furnished by the export associations and they will no doubt differ somewhat from the figures for the government fiscal year. The export of newsprint to Australia reached a rather low ebb, during 1908 it amounted to only 52,767 tons out of a total of, in round figures, 160,000 tons, imported by that dominion. I was under the impression, as I know most hon. members are, that the newsprint item in the treaty was largely for the benefit of the Pacific coast. On looking the matter up however I find that the Pacific coast is shipping only 40 per cent of the exports from Canada to Australia and that the remaining 60 per cent comes from eastern Canadian mills. It is interesting to note that at the present time we divide the Australian market with Great Britain, Canada furnishing about one-third and Great Britain the other two-thirds of Australia's requirements.

I would not like to agree with the hon. members to my left in the sentiments which they expressed yesterday showing their lack of interest in our exports to Australia. I am sure that the farmers of my province and also the farmers of the province of Quebec, who benefit directly from the paper mills, will not agree with those sentiments. One company alone in the province of Quebec last year purchased \$450,000 of farm products direct