

Australian Treaty—Mr. Dickie

Robb, who has departed from us, came back from Australia, he had different views with respect to the treaty. If we then had passed a tariff such as good economic sense would dictate, a tariff of eight cents a pound on butter against the world and especially against the United States, we could have given Australia a concession which would have been satisfactory to them and still not have had the effect of destroying, as the treaty extended to New Zealand has done, the dairy business of Canada. In an excellent speech made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman)—and I would advise the hon. member for Comox-Alberni to study that hon. gentleman's speech and see whether he cannot make one somewhat along the same lines because it was a speech full of kindness to all concerned—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would suggest the hon. member might sting himself before he got through.

Mr. DICKIE: No. In a very excellent speech the hon. member for Red Deer gave expression to views with which we are perhaps at variance, but his remarks were made in such a delightful manner that one could not but admire his sincerity, although one might, in one's self conceit, deplore his economic views. That speech, however, made a great impression upon me and reminded me of a point which I have forgotten. That is all I wish to say on the question. I am absolutely opposed to abrogating the Australian treaty, to doing anything to antagonize those people against the people of British Columbia or Canada. Our opinion on this side of the house is that the amendment to the amendment does not do that; it asks simply that a treaty be entered into which will confer greater advantages upon Australians as well as upon ourselves. If as a result of the amendment to the amendment the government were to go out of power—and I have no thought that such will be the case—I do not think Canada would suffer to any great extent.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the amendment which was moved to the motion to go into supply by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) representing the groups in the southeast corner, is of course a definite want of confidence motion, but it expresses, according to those who have supported it, their desires with respect to the subject matter of it. The sponsors of the amendment desire that the Australian treaty should be abrogated forthwith and they base their contention upon the [Mr. Dickie.]

idea that the Australian treaty at present existing imposes a hardship on agriculture as an industry for the benefit of other industries and they quote in support of their argument a great many figures and references from the treaty itself. I propose in that connection to apply the practical test rather than the theoretical test. Has the Australian treaty injured agriculture in Canada? The answer to that question will be found, of course, in the answer to another question. Have the imports of agricultural products from Australia been of such a character and in such volume as injuriously to affect agriculture in this Dominion? I have before me the statistics of the trade of Canada, and I can best illustrate by quoting directly from the import figures from Australia during the last fiscal year, ending March 31, 1929. I shall quote all of the articles which could even conceivably be considered to come into competition with any branch of Canadian agriculture or horticulture. I will give the figures in round numbers:

Value of Importations from Australia in
Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1929

Apples..	\$ 91
Grapes..	5,000
Other fresh fruits..	2,000
Canned fruits..	93,000
Onions..	18,000
Peas..	280
Seeds..	27
Beef..	97,000
Mutton..	377,000
Butter..	93,000
Raw wool..	136,000

That comprises the full list of articles which we imported from Australia in the fiscal year 1929 which could in any sense be argued to come into competition with any branch of Canadian agriculture. I wish to ask the members of this house if they deem these imports, to the values that I have read, injuriously to affect Canadian agriculture to such a degree as to warrant the abrogation of the treaty. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the workmen engaged in the industries, the lumber industry, the motor industry, and all the other industries which were exporting to Australia in the same year under the treaty, consumed far more of the same products than were imported from Australia in that year; in fact, the very trade which was developed in Canada under this treaty produced a greater market in Canada for the agricultural commodities that we imported from Australia than Australia itself supplied. It increased the demand for the products of the Canadian farm and the Canadian orchard.

Let us look at the history of this treaty, again from a practical point of view. It is