

*Australian Treaty—Mr. Neill*

Those were my sentiments in 1928, and they are my sentiments to-day—curiously enough.

A number of the British Columbia members who have spoken in this debate have asked for a revision of the treaty, and they have given as their reason, and quite properly so, their desire that Canada should get something better out of the treaty, should be able to sell more produce to Australia under it. It seems a somewhat roundabout way of trying to accomplish that object to move a motion of want of confidence in the government. We may presume that they are sincere in moving want of confidence, and if so, they must hope that it will carry. That is quite all right from their point of view. I myself have sometimes wished to see the government defeated. We will suppose that their object is achieved, that the government is defeated on the motion of want of confidence. It does not make a great deal of difference whether it is on the amendment moved by the Progressive group, who want to see the treaty abrogated, or whether it is on the motion of the official opposition, who want the treaty revised along certain lines. I ask you, sir, what would be the effect on the minds of the Australians if it were wired to them to-night or to-morrow morning that the government of Canada, and incidentally the government that passed the treaty, had been defeated on the Australian treaty. By the time the news got jumbled up on the wires it would not be clear, nor would it be of very great importance, to the people of Australia whether the government had been defeated on the amendment or on the subamendment, but the impression on their minds would undoubtedly be that Canada did not want the treaty, that Canada had asked for its abrogation or its revision, and that the government of the day had been defeated over that question.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I do not think it will involve the defeat of the government.

Mr. NEILL: They hope so. They say it is going to carry. What are they voting for if they do not expect that? I ask you, sir, and the house, looking at the question from a sober point of view, so to speak, if Australia in that event would be likely to agree to a treaty that would be more favourable to Canada than the present one. If it is not going to be more favourable, why ask for a new treaty? The effect upon Australia would be especially bad when they found that the two parties in this house, who support these two amendments and particularly the members who introduced the two motions of want of confidence, both voted against the original treaty and that both have been fairly active in their condemnation of it ever since.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. ADSHEAD: May I ask a question? When the Liberal whip proposed a subamendment the other evening and it was carried, the government was not defeated. Why should it be defeated now if the subamendment carries?

Mr. NEILL: Because the subamendment moved the other evening was of such a character that the government could accept it, and I have not forgotten how hon. gentlemen opposite tried to raise a great constitutional crisis because the government, they claimed, had defeated themselves, by accepting that subamendment.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has suggested that we might, so to speak, placate or please the Australians by increasing the duties on the articles that we buy from them, and then give them a greater preference to help them out. I wonder what kind of a repercussion that meets with from my Progressive friends. It is not in line with the policies which they had adopted up to now. At all events, I suggest that the preferences granted to Australia now are already substantial enough, and if Australia is not benefiting by them, it is not the fault of the preferences. Here are some of the preferences that Australia receives:

	Preference to Australia per lb.
Honey.. . . . .	3c. to 1c.
Raisins.. . . . .	3c. to 0c.
Lard.. . . . .	2c. to 0c.
Tallow.. . . . .	20% to 10%
Cheese.. . . . .	3c. to 0c.
Butter.. . . . .	4c. to 1c.
Canned vegetables.. . . . .	1½c. to 0c.
Dried apples.. . . . .	25% to 10%
Fruits, pears, etc.. . . . .	50c. to 25c. per 100 lbs.

On sugar the rate varies according to the analysis, but Australia has a preference of something like 50 to 66 per cent.

It is true that Australia is not selling us these products in the volume they expected, but I submit that that is solely the fault of Australia. You can drive a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink. We have done our part, and it is now up to Australia to make the horse drink. Australia made the great mistake of thinking that the mere introduction of a favourable tariff was all sufficient to develop trade. It is not so, and never will be so. Their products are not put up in the style and package with which we are familiar, nor are their goods pushed by energetic salesmen, as is the case with the products of other countries. Australia will never penetrate our market until she realizes the need of competent salesmen, and the