

A great deal has been said about the imports of butter, and a few minutes ago the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) stated that those imports were insignificant. The viewpoint taken in regard to this tariff question seems to depend largely on whose ox is being gored. In 1925 the imports of butter amounted to 198,341 pounds, while, as a result of this Australian treaty, they had increased in 1929 to 35,928,249 pounds.

Mr. NEILL: I was speaking definitely about Australia; the hon. member is adding the imports from New Zealand. He might as well include Belgium or any other country.

Mr. LUCAS: When we ask for the abrogation of the Australian treaty we include the abrogation of the New Zealand treaty which was brought into effect by order in council.

Mr. NEILL: That is a separate matter.

Mr. LUCAS: It is well understood that when Canada negotiated a treaty with Australia each country extended to the other certain advantages in respect to lowered tariff. New Zealand asked that the same advantages should be extended to her, and by order in council 1757 the Australian treaty was made applicable to New Zealand.

Mr. NEILL: The doing away with the Australian treaty will not cancel Canada's obligation to New Zealand; that is a separate agreement.

Mr. LUCAS: The agreement states that subject to the provisions of the customs tariff of 1907, the governor in council may by order in council extend the advantages to the goods, produce and manufacture of any British country. If there were no treaty with Australia there would be no basis for an agreement with New Zealand.

In 1925 the importations of meat and meat products amounted to \$4,264,076, but by 1929 that figure had increased to \$5,904,979. Those are the figures for the imports from all countries, but it will be found that the imports from Australia and New Zealand have been increasing very rapidly for the last few years. On top of all this, the farmer has been compelled to pay more for his raisins, so is it any wonder that he is complaining? He is faced with competition in his own market and forced to pay higher prices for those commodities which he has to buy.

As I said before, this tariff question seems to be a matter of whose ox is being gored. I could not agree with the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) when he stated a short time ago that labour was in a different position from that of the cow. The

attitude of the Labour members in this house has been to protect labour through keeping out of the country the large influx of labour which desires to come here. I do not blame them for taking that attitude, but is there any difference in protecting the farmers? The farmer's reward is the price he obtains for his products, and I think the farmer is asking only for that protection asked for by the Labour party.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Labour which is imported into Canada becomes part of the citizenship and national life of the country; cows do not.

Mr. LUCAS: I am putting it upon the basis of a cow; the farmer has to get his reward from the cow. Surely the farmer becomes just as good a citizen of this country as does the labour man and has just as good a right to a fair reward for his labour.

A few days ago when a resolution was introduced into the house by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) asking for a reduction of the tariff on motor trucks, to which an amendment was moved by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) that the debate be adjourned because he did not have sufficient information, the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) supported that amendment till he also could get further information. The result, of course, was to retain the tariff. I think all hon. members are agreed that the tariff on motor trucks and motor cars is much too high.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): What was the amendment to which my hon. friend refers?

Mr. LUCAS: I think the hon. member is familiar with the resolution moved by the hon. member for Macleod, asking for a reduction of the tariff on motor trucks.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): What was the amendment to that resolution to which my hon. friend referred?

Mr. LUCAS: The amendment was moved by the hon. leader of the opposition that the debate be adjourned on the ground that he did not have sufficient information; nor did my hon. friend (Mr. Young, Weyburn), have sufficient information although he had been talking about free trade for all these years. When this question was up for debate a few days ago he defended the New Zealand treaty, and then turned around and voted to revise that treaty. If that treaty is revised, what other class of goods can we get from New Zealand except farm products?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): How did my hon. friend vote on that occasion?