

the Australian treaty, in, for instance, the paper industry, the motor industry, iron and steel, and the fishing industry. It is well known that trade begets trade, and although lumber and lumber products may not be mentioned in the treaty, we know that if our trade with Australia and New Zealand is developed in certain lines, other lines will follow and there will be larger quantities of lumber and other products go to Australia and New Zealand, to the benefit of the Canadian people.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, I should continue at greater length. I do appeal to hon. members opposite to give this treaty, which has been entered into in good faith, with a view to being advantageous to both dominions of our empire, at least an opportunity to demonstrate its advantages. If disadvantages should develop there is a proviso, as is well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, whereby the treaty can be cancelled on six months' notice. But that is not the desire of the Conservative party to-day. Their one desire is not inter-imperial trade, not empire trade, but to trade places with the government and to get on this side of the House. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is a greater object at this time. Would it not be well to concede to the government, which has been sustained up to the present by the members of the House, not simply on one vote but on several votes, the right to reconstruct and reorganize their ranks in order that they may meet parliament and carry out the sessional programme that is indicated in the Speech from the Throne?

We have heard many speeches, and it has been noticeable, Mr. Speaker, that since the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen) made his speech, in which he went over item by item the proposed legislation of the government and in most cases commended it, there has apparently been a studied effort to keep away from the matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and to discuss amendments such as we have before us now. I believe it is the desire of the majority of this parliament to put into legislative enactment the programme outlined in the Speech from the Throne, and I believe it is the desire of the people of Canada that parliament should be allowed to proceed with that work. I believe the people of Canada are fair enough to say that the government having met parliament and having been endorsed by the majority in parliament, should have the right to reconstruct their ranks; I have enough confidence in the sportsmanship and fair play of the Canadian people to believe that.

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Let me also say this: In my mind, and in the mind of many observers, the Conservative party, in this House, which through its board of strategy may have thought to serve that party, has failed to serve that party well. Further, I know that they have done parliament and parliamentary institutions in this country great harm by this obstruction. The government have not asked a great deal. Surely they were entitled to ask for an adjournment, just as my hon. friends opposite, if parliament had decided that they should rule, would have had the right to ask for and would have received an adjournment; there is no question about that. The primary reason for calling together this parliament was to decide whether the government or our hon. friends opposite would have the majority. Up to the present the government have had the majority, and they are entitled to go on until there is an adverse majority against them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Then go on.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Don't adjourn.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We can go on very well; there is no question about that. But would it not be better and in the interests of all parties that parliament should adjourn, and that time should be given the government for reconstruction, after which parliament would reassemble and go on with the business of the country?

Mr. J. A. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, allow me in the first place to endorse all the felicitations and congratulations which have been extended to you upon your fair-mindedness and ability to carry out the onerous duties of the high office to which you have been re-elected.

First of all, I wish to refer to this question of alleged obstruction. The government have very sedulously propagated the idea that the opposition is obstructing the business of this country by the tactics they are pursuing on the floor of this House. That opinion was put forward a few days ago by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). It is true that the question was taken up on this side of the House this afternoon, but I want to carry a little further the argument that was made to-day that we are not obstructing the business of the country. I notice also that the government press has put forward the idea that this party is obstructing the business of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.