

gentlemen who sit in that corner of the house are perfectly honest and sincere, and in season and out of season have advocated certain principles; but I must add that while I still retain my confidence in their honesty and sincerity I have perhaps a little less regard for the intellectual capacity which they have displayed in facing this particular question. Their sense of logic does not seem to be as highly developed as one would have expected it to be after the years they have spent in this house. Consciously or unconsciously the United Farmers of Alberta in the resolution that they passed at their convention, and in the position which they have taken in this house, have endorsed the principle of protection of agricultural products. I say that, consciously or unconsciously, they have done that.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is that because they asked for the abrogation of the Australian treaty?

Mr. BROWN: I am going to explain that. The amendment has been brought before the house under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It will be recalled that a short time ago the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) moved that the house go into committee of supply. He was met by an amendment from the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) to the effect that the order in council extending the provisions of the Australian treaty to New Zealand be rescinded and a treaty be negotiated with New Zealand. From this side of the house then there was moved another amendment, the terms of which are quite familiar, indicating the desirability of making a treaty with New Zealand in matters of trade.

Now, when this question of the Australian treaty was brought before the convention of the United Farmers of Alberta, and especially when reference was made to that treaty by the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Kellner) in speaking to the amendment on the motion to go into supply, it indicated to me very clearly that it had reference to the general situation that has developed in regard to Australia butter and the propaganda that has been carried on throughout Canada for the placing of a duty on such butter.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Just for accuracy—on New Zealand butter.

Mr. BROWN: I beg your pardon; on New Zealand butter. Now, it was either intended to be considered in connection with that question or it was not. If it was intended to be considered in relation to the general question of duties on New Zealand butter, then the

hon. members in that particular corner of the house have certainly by their action endorsed the demand that we should have protection against New Zealand butter. There can be no getting away from that. If, on the other hand, they say there is no connection between the two, that this present amendment for the abrogation of the Australian treaty is something entirely distinct from the question of New Zealand butter, then what position do they find themselves in? They find themselves in this position, that when a very important question was under discussion the other day, that is, the question of making a trade treaty with New Zealand, hon. gentlemen there had nothing to say in the matter; they sat perfectly still and refused to vote one way or the other. And we may very properly ask why?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Is the hon. member asking the question now?

Mr. BROWN: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The members in this corner of the house, knowing the effect of the subamendment, equally with that of the amendment, was a vote of want of confidence in the government, did not wish to associate themselves with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), and his associates in voting want of confidence in the government, or with the opposition in attempting to defend the government from their attack.

Mr. BROWN: I do not very clearly catch the force of the reason. I have not been aware that up to the present time hon. members in that particular corner of the house have shown any aversion to voting want of confidence in the government when it suited them.

Now, the situation is simply this. Here is a most important question brought to the notice of this house, the question of making a trade treaty with New Zealand, and hon. members simply sit there silent, and we do not know yet whether they are in favour of such a treaty or not. They have not said whether they are in favour of it or not. That is the situation in which they find themselves.

Mr. GARDINER: I may say to the hon. member that when the treaty comes before the house we will deal with it.

Mr. BROWN: But the hon. gentleman has not said whether he is in favour of any kind of treaty.

Mr. GARDINER: I want to see what the treaty is first.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Wait and see.

Mr. BROWN: I am afraid that an argument of that kind will hardly be sufficient