

*Australian Treaty—Mr. Stevens*

some advantage in the Canadian market with respect to the products that I have mentioned and others.

Time will not permit me to analyze this matter further, as I have only a moment or two more. Let me summarize thus: I do not think it is necessary, in making a treaty with Australia for the purchase of goods from that country, in any way to injure a Canadian industry; and I will specify, for instance, the butter industry and the egg industry. Without sacrificing these Canadian industries, without injuring them at all, we can open to Australia our market in Canada for such goods as we purchase from other countries, particularly the United States, and by doing that, by revising the treaty, we can materially increase our purchases from Australia, and at the same time, I think, find a more hearty response on the part of Australia for the entry of our goods into their market, to the advantage of Canadian producers. I beg therefore to move, seconded by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Plunkett), in amendment to the amendment moved by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Gardiner):

That all the words after the word "house" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

the operation of the existing Australian treaty indicates that the fullest development of trade between Canada and Australia has not been achieved by either country and the government should endeavour as soon as possible to secure a revision of the treaty, to the mutual benefit of both countries.

In moving this amendment, I again affirm my adherence to the principle of increasing our trade with Australia, by treaty agreement, if you wish, or by any other means that will be mutually satisfactory to both countries; but certainly the present treaty should be so revised as to give an added advantage to either country in the market of the other.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): In view of the speech made this afternoon by my hon. friend from Acadia (Mr. Gardiner), the leader of the United Farmers of Alberta, it is perhaps to be expected that I should make some brief reply.

In my speech the other day I spoke of what I called the great apostasy. I find that the hon. member for Acadia hunted up a very excellent dictionary, for it gave exactly the definition of apostasy that was in my own mind. The hon. member has defended his right to change his principles. I certainly am not disputing that right. Perhaps it might be very convenient at other times for others to claim that same right. However, if it is

[Mr. Stevens.]

proper to change your principles it is certainly permissible to change your tactics, and sometimes when we in this house are accused of changing our principles I would point out that what we have changed, if we have changed anything at all, is simply our tactics—adopting different means of obtaining the same thing.

I might point out, for instance, that those in Saskatchewan who now call themselves the Progressives have done what hon. members in that corner of the house where my hon. friend from Acadia sits have persistently refused to do; they have accepted some of the responsibilities of government. If we in this part of the house have in any way changed our tactics, it is because we have felt that we should assume some of the obligations of government which hon. members in that corner of the house have persistently refused to accept. Their position has been that they would like simply to sit on the fence and jump this way or that as the circumstances require. That may be a very comfortable position when you are able to maintain it, but I am more than ever convinced that permanent government cannot be carried on in that way, and I would like to point out to hon. members that the Prime Minister of Great Britain has recently made the statement, as reported in the press, that he will not be dictated to by the opposition. I think in that statement there is room for thought on the part of those who think it is possible for a minority in parliament to be the final arbiter of the country's policies. The Saskatchewan Progressives, in their provincial affairs, have recognized the folly of that position, and whether the government that has been formed in Saskatchewan is a good one or not, certainly the necessity has been impressed upon the Progressives in that province of uniting with the Conservative party in order that government might be carried on. It is not a matter of concern whether it is a good or a bad government; the important thing is that the necessity of taking that position was impressed upon the Progressives. It is said that politics sometimes make strange bedfellows, and it would certainly be strange to see the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) associated in the next federal campaign with those in Saskatchewan who will undoubtedly be supporting the policies of the official opposition in this house. He says that they have not changed their principles, and I must take his word for it. If there is anything sinister in my use of the word "apostasy," I am certainly pleased to withdraw it, and to admit that the hon.