

the Commonwealth of Australia. From this it is quite evident that those who are responsible for negotiating the treaty on behalf of Canada had pointed out to the Australian Minister of Trade and Commerce the possibilities of severe opposition to this particular scheme. A few days ago we discussed the question of the Australian treaty as it applied to New Zealand. It is not my intention of course to go over that ground again, but in view of the attitude that the Conservative party has taken towards the Australian treaty as applied to New Zealand, I want to call the attention of the house to a very peculiar situation. When the Australian treaty was brought into existence butter from that country was permitted to come into Canada on the basis of a duty of one cent a pound. Now, my friends to my immediate right criticized the Australian treaty as applied to New Zealand. Why? Because they claimed that butter was coming here from New Zealand in large quantities, and consequently was depressing the price obtained by the Canadian farmer. I do not hold any brief in that regard at all; I do not think that that is correct. But what I want to call the attention of the house to is this: If it had not been for a certain occurrence in Australia, namely, what is termed the Patterson scheme, which provides for a bonus on butter exported from Australia, I wonder what position our friends of the Conservative party would be in to-day? Probably they are very much in favour of the Australian treaty as it works out at the present time. But what would their opinion be, so far as agriculture is concerned, if, for instance, Australia were to discontinue the bonus and its butter was allowed to come in here on the basis of a one cent per pound duty? Australian butter is not imported at the present time simply because of the fact that, being bonused, we have invoked the dumping duty. But what would happen to our friends' views on the Australian treaty if this bonus were discontinued and consequently there could be no excuse for applying the dumping duty against Australian butter?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Does my hon. friend approve of the dumping duty?

Mr. GARDINER: Well, generally speaking, I have not much use for the dumping duty at all.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): In this case?

Mr. GARDINER: Well, in view of the fact that Australian export butter is still bonused, I have no objection to the application of the dumping duty under the cir-
[Mr. Gardiner.]

cumstances. When a country starts to bonus its exports, it places itself in a different position altogether from a country which does not bonus its exports.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Is that bonus paid out of the revenues of the country?

Mr. GARDINER: No, it is paid by the people who produce the butter. Nevertheless it is probable that the consumers in Australia pay a little more because of the bonus. However, that is not an important question at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the house for any length of time, but certain criticisms have been levelled against the action taken by the United Farmers of Alberta at their last annual convention, and it is my purpose to deal with those criticisms. The first criticism came from my hon. friend the member for Weyburn (Mr. Young). When the Australian treaty as applied to New Zealand was under discussion in this house he made certain remarks with regard to my position on that treaty. I am not going to read all that he said on the occasion, and anything that I do quote from Hansard, Mr. Speaker, will be on a point of privilege, because I submit the statement then made is not correct. He said he was very much disappointed in the attitude of the members in this corner of the house, particularly myself.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): That is correct.

Mr. GARDINER: He goes on to talk about the principles which we have stood for for so long, and he says:

They have here advocated protection for the farmer and asked for the abrogation of this treaty in so far as it applied to New Zealand.

I never made such a statement, Mr. Speaker. It is incorrect. The only reference I made to the Australian treaty in the course of my address early in the session as it applied to New Zealand was, in part, as follows:

and finally concluded a treaty with the Australian government, which treaty was finally extended to New Zealand.

That is the only reference I made to New Zealand at all. I did not discuss the Australian treaty in any shape or form as it was applied to New Zealand. I discussed the Australian treaty primarily on the grounds that I am discussing it this afternoon. My hon. friend evidently is disappointed with members in this corner of the house because of the fact that in annual convention the United Farmers of Alberta passed a certain resolution, and because we had given voice to the wishes of the organization of which we are members. But my hon. friend had better look