

## SUPPLY—AUSTRALIAN TREATY

AMENDMENTS TO MOTION OF MINISTER OF  
FINANCE FOR COMMITTEE

The house resumed from Wednesday, March 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Dunning for committee of supply, the amendment thereto of Mr. Gardiner, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Stevens.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I think I might summarize the few remarks that I propose to make at this time in one brief sentence, and that is, "Hands off the Australian treaty," at the present time at least. That is a slogan or watchword that I believe would be acceptable in the office of every big industry in British Columbia, and in Vancouver and Victoria especially. It will find an echo in the shack of the fisherman, in the bunkhouse of the lumberman, in the home of the workers in our sawmills and pulp and paper plants, and even in the homes of our coal miners and of those who work on the farm, because all alike are vitally interested in the preservation of the Australian treaty. I include both capital, the management or operators, and those who work in these industries as employees, because they have a common interest. Employers and employees may have differences of opinion in regard to the wages paid or as to their other relations, but the ordinary manual workers are coming to realize more and more that they have at least this common interest with their employers, that if they cannot find a market for their products, if they cannot sell what they produce, it means the slowing down of the wheels of industry, with consequent unemployment and lower wages. Therefore, I say that both employers and employees are a unit in a matter of this kind.

I added to the slogan the words, especially at the present time; I shall explain that a little later.

I propose, as I said last night, to consider the question before us without any regard to the bickerings of party politics or the constant jangle as regards high or low tariff. I think we have heard enough of that. I propose therefore to deal with this question on its merits, to consider how it will affect Canada, how it will affect the province from which I come, and more particularly, how it will affect the interests of my constituents whom I represent here in this house. We are considering to-day a motion of want of confidence in the government moved by the Progressive element in this house, coupled with a demand for the abrogation, which means the abandonment, of the Australian treaty. We have also before

us a subamendment moved by a member representing the Conservative element in this house. That also is a motion of want of confidence, coupled with a demand that the Australian treaty be revised.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Would it be a vote of want of confidence if it carried, considering the ruling of Mr. Speaker the other evening?

Mr. NEILL: Yes, both of them would. While the Conservative amendment asks only for the revision of the treaty, not its abrogation, I propose to submit that conditions are such that if their motion carried, it would result in the abrogation or abandonment of the treaty. We are not dealing at all with the New Zealand aspect of the case nor with the importation of New Zealand butter. The house settled that matter a few days ago, and the government has decided to negotiate a separate treaty with New Zealand. So New Zealand is entirely out of the picture. We are dealing to-day with the Australian treaty and the Australian treaty alone.

I am completely against both the amendment and the subamendment, and if the suggestion that I have heard is true—I trust that it is not—that the government, working along the lines of least resistance or for the sake of political peace, might accept the subamendment, then I am against the government as well, and my position would indeed then be one of loneliness.

I am in favour of the Australian treaty and always have been, although I am not in favour of its extension to New Zealand. I should like to quote, if I may, three sentences from some remarks I made in the house on March 5, 1928. I said:

The National Dairy Association has presented three resolutions to the government. The first one asks that the Australian treaty as applied to New Zealand be cancelled. I am heartily in agreement with that.

I would pause there for a moment to point out that my attitude then was the same as my attitude a few weeks ago when I put a resolution on the order paper dealing with New Zealand butter. This gives contradiction to the statement made that my convictions in this matter were of new found origin of a few weeks ago. Quoting again from my remarks:

The second resolution asks that the dumping clause be applied on all butter sent from Australia to Canada either on direct sale or consignment as long as the Paterson scheme of bonusing exists. I agree with that suggestion and I will go further. I suggest that the dumping clause should be strengthened.

The third resolution asked that the Australian treaty be done away with altogether. I am flatly and entirely opposed to that.