

do now leave the chair, and that the house resolve itself into committee of supply. To that resolution the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Gardiner) has moved an amendment to the effect that the house do declare for the immediate repeal of the Australian treaty, and it is my intention before I resume my seat to move a subamendment to which I shall refer in a moment.

In discussing the amendment the leader of the Progressive party indicated that his chief objection to the Australian treaty was that it gave some advantages to highly protected industries, but did not give consideration to the products of the farm. I think that briefly states the argument of my hon. friend.

The hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) who seconded the amendment took a slightly different position. His stand might be summed up by saying that he was absolutely and unreservedly opposed to all forms of imposition of customs duties, and for that reason he was opposed to a treaty which in any sense was involved in the tariff. I would like to make one or two observations regarding the two speeches to which I have referred.

With regard to the speech of the mover of the amendment, I might say that he referred to the highly protected industries of Canada which are getting, according to his view, some advantage from the treaty. May I call to his attention the fact that the lumber industry is one that would get some advantage, and lumber is on the free list so far as Canada is concerned. I refer to the lumber industry of British Columbia and eastern Canada as they compete with the world in the lumber market. So that to the extent that his remarks in this respect would apply to lumber the facts are not in harmony with his argument. Then, in regard to paper, which is another Canadian industry, and has some preference in the Australian market, may I point out that that industry has a very small protection of 10, 12½ and 15 per cent. That is not a protection which can in any sense be called a high one. There are other items on the list upon which the duty does not in any sense amount to a high protection.

My hon. friend from Rosetown, in his rather doleful presentation of the case, said that the Conservative party had never shown itself in any sense anxious for the welfare of the farmers, and he referred particularly to this treaty. May I beg the hon. member to direct his attention to the words of the leader of the Conservative party at the time the treaty was first introduced into the house, and may I point out to him and to the government that from that day to this we have

consistently criticised this treaty on the very points to which I am about to refer. We have not criticised the treaty as a whole, and I shall deal very fully with that point in a moment. So far as our attitude as a party is concerned, however, it has been consistently in the interests of the farmers of Canada as they are affected by this treaty. The leader of the party at that time, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, on June 23, 1925 called attention to the fact that the treaty as introduced in the house was not the treaty that was originally negotiated by the Canadian government with the government of Australia, but that under pressure from certain members in the house modifications had been made and another schedule had been substituted for the original one.

The Right Hon. Arthur Meighen is quoted in Hansard at page 4784 as follows:

In the first treaty, as in this, agriculture was called upon to pay for those advantages. But agriculture got some compensation.

That is in the first draft of the treaty. Then he went on to point out that in the present treaty the agriculturists were deprived of the slight advantage given to them in the original draft, and he questions the government in this language:

Now, may I ask why did the government retreat from its pledge with Australia and go back and ask for a new treaty?

And further on he says:

It is wise, I say, to make a concession to get these things, but by this treaty the government just calls on the mixed farmer of Canada to be good enough to step up to the counter and pay the whole cost of the concessions that they have given Australia.

Mr. ADSHEAD: From what is the hon. gentleman quoting?

Mr. STEVENS: I am quoting from the speech of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen who was at that time the leader of and speaking for the Conservative party. He says:

Out of him—

The farmer.

—and him alone comes the whole price, and in compensation they give him not one single concession.

He further says:

I would like to know upon what principle of equity he makes the Canadian farmer pay the whole of this.

I shall not quote further, but I do submit that to my hon. friend from Rosetown, because I think it is only reasonable that he should do us the justice of admitting that from that day down to the present we have expressed our criticisms of this treaty on the