

tariff. That is the business of the people of the United States and Australia. I am here to attend to Canadian business; I am here to tell the Canadian government that I am finding fault with them and not with the government of the United States or Australia. The United States farmers make representations to congress that they want enacted such and such a law. For instance, they say that they want a duty of eight cents a pound imposed on butter going into the United States, and congress goes to work and very wisely gives their farmers the protection they want. Legislation of this character is enacted at the demand of the United States farmer or the Australian farmer, and if that is a good principle for the Australian or the United States farmer, why is it not a good principle for our Canadian farmer to pursue? Why would the Canadian farmer not be just as glad to put that extra three or four cents a pound into his pocket as the United States or Australian farmer? I commend those two governments for doing what they are asked to do by the people who are interested in the different industries, and they must be interested or they would never have got that legislation passed. The United States congress or the Australian Commonwealth parliament are not going to enact laws unless they are requested to do so by people who are interested in the industry concerned.

I am not arguing in favour of the abrogation of the Australian treaty. I claim that if the Australians, in their superior judgment and wisdom and by virtue of the fact that they have men of greater ability to represent them in the making of treaties, secure a certain advantage over us, they are entitled to it; but the agitation on this matter should not be allowed to stop until we get these public men out of the way and let some person step in who can make a treaty that is equal all around. I have every sympathy with inter-imperial trade, and I am not going to argue in favour of the abrogation of the Australian treaty just because in it there are certain things which should be corrected and which we shall soon correct if hon. gentlemen opposite will only let us get men of good judgment in charge of the government of this country.

Another reason why we should not be too anxious to ask for the abrogation of this treaty is because certain of our people enjoy advantages under it. For instance, our pulp and paper men, our salmon canners, and also, I think, manufacturers of certain automobile parts and probably automobiles themselves, enjoy substantial advantages in the Australian markets and they are entitled to the advan-

[Mr. Fraser.]

tages which they enjoy in those different lines of industry. If they require that in order to make a little better profit and to stabilize their industry in this country, I am not going to argue that the treaty should be abrogated and these advantages be taken away from them just because the treaty is not fair all around. If one set of men can make a treaty which is not altogether fair, surely another set of men with a little better judgment can be got together to make things fair and just to all.

I want to read certain telegrams which I have received from the pulp and paper industry in British Columbia, a province of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives in this parliament. Both of these telegrams protest against the removal of their advantages under this treaty. I am pretty familiar with the Powell River Pulp and Paper Company. No company is better organized than this. It treats its men fairly and everything is done in an up-to-date manner. The employees are provided with all the care and attention that they should have and nothing is left that could be desired. Everything is provided for the comfort and convenience of these men. On the other hand, the men realize this and they have every respect for the company for which they are working. The company telegraphs:

With reference to amendment to Speech from Throne dealing with the Australian treaty, we would urge upon you that based on this treaty we are expending some eight million dollars in plant extensions hoping to get our share of Australian business and abrogation of treaty would be manifestly unfair particularly without giving it a fair trial. We are satisfied that investigation will disclose that the treaty is both favourable and valuable to Canada.

The other one is from the Pacific Mills, Limited, an organization of which I know very little, but I know it is a bona fide pulp and paper mill company. What I have said with reference to the Powell River Pulp and Paper Company would apply equally to Pacific Mills Limited. I would call the attention of the House to the following telegram:

We are advised that Mr. Donald Sutherland, M.P. representing dairy interests contemplates amendment to throne speech criticising Australian treaty on ground that such interests are being jeopardized. You are thoroughly familiar with treaty naturally and have full access to customs import figures and we are satisfied that any investigation will show that such is not the case. Further than that while the treaty has only been operative four months the benefits to the paper industry and the country as a whole so far exceed any slight disadvantages that any criticism at this time will do great harm both in Australia and in Canada.