

of maintaining the sanctity of the home as those who voted against it but we have divorce and have to deal with it. So it is with protection; I believe the farmers of Canada are still opposed to the principle of protection, but they realize that Canada has a tariff with no hope of it being lowered and they then insist that it be administered on a basis of equality, or as near equality as can be, for all concerned.

Mr. C. H. DICKIE (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, I rise for a moment or two to correct a false impression which may go abroad with respect to some remarks that were made yesterday afternoon in the course of a very able address by the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley). He claimed that because a very important member of the Conservative party had insisted that the Australian treaty should be abrogated, our party was practically put on record as being in favour of abrogating that treaty. I do not think that is much of an argument, but it seems to be more or less accepted by those who were paying attention to his speech. You might just as well ask hon. members from the province of Quebec whether they were bound by what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) said when he sounded the death knell of protection. We on this side of the house have views of our own; we are not blind driven cattle. Although there are on this side of the house some who may favour the abrogation of the Australian treaty, a majority on the Conservative side are absolutely opposed to that action.

With respect to the advice so nicely handed out by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), I should like to ask that hon. gentleman to confine his attention to his own constituency, because that is about as far as his vision has ever extended in the house—that and keeping the government in power. We hon. members from Vancouver island quite realize what we are doing and whether it is good politics or not we are trying in a large way to do something for the Dominion of Canada besides trying to keep ourselves in power. If that hon. gentleman could only extract a little pleasure out of some of his remarks, he might be excused, but he seems to make himself more miserable every time he says anything. In the tepid waters of the southern Pacific ocean there is a petulant fish known as the stingaree. If you happen to tread on that fish it will sting you. If it cannot sting you, it gets so angry it stings itself. I am sometimes reminded of that fish.

I see nothing dangerous in the amendment to the amendment moved by the Conservative side of the house in regard to the Australian treaty. It is simply an expression of opinion

that an endeavour be made to see whether a more equitable treaty cannot be entered into. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni tells of the consternation of the lumbering people of Vancouver island. Our United States friends shipped \$12,000,000 worth of lumber to the Antipodes, to Australia, while we of British Columbia shipped only a measly \$144,000 worth last year. We want to see whether we cannot obtain some concession from those people in order to enable us to ship more of our lumber to Australia, especially in view of the fact that the United States have practically told us that we cannot ship them lumber, because that is what the duty of \$1.50 on rough lumber means.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) pointed out certain advantages that might accrue to Australia by a revision of the treaty. We wish not to abrogate the treaty but to try to do something for Australia, for empire trade. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre pointed out where we might do something in the matter of importing hides from that country and he indicated how that might accrue to their advantage. He also showed how we might confer immense advantage on that country by buying their dried fruits instead of those of the United States who are milking us dry year after year of an immense amount of money which should be distributed throughout the British Empire. He also told us we might import sugar from Australia. There are many things that might enter into a discussion of a revision of this treaty and that would amply justify such a revision. If the Australian people, as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni suggests, are ready to throw up this treaty, they would give us six months' notice and throw it up to-morrow. There is no danger of that. We can enter into negotiations with those people in the friendliest spirit in an endeavour to do something which is good for empire trade and which will keep our money within the empire.

When this treaty was entered into with Australia, we were not in favour of all its clauses, but I think none of us voted against it when it was put to a vote in the house. We thought then as we think now, that agriculture paid the whole bill for the treaty. We thought a treaty could be arranged whereby the agriculturists of Canada would not be penalized as heavily as they were in order that we of the Pacific coast might receive a few concessions. However, we debated that question and we were unable to have the treaty arranged along any different lines. We all know when that splendid gentleman, Mr.