

Mr. NEILL: I should like, if I may, to revert for a moment to the remarks made this afternoon by the hon. member for West Kootenay (Mr. Esling). He went a long distance out of his way, and flew over mountain ranges and valleys to attack the very innocent members from the coast and northern British Columbia. We have not done anything to him, but he saw fit to deal with our local matters and local conditions in connection with which he very speedily showed his ignorance. I think if we had time to go into his economics we would find that he was just as unsound there as he was hazy in his geography.

The hon. member exhausted almost all the adjectives and many of the adverbs in the English language in expressing his surprise and almost horror that certain members from the coast of British Columbia should have voted against this treaty which, by the way, was not under discussion at the time, since we were discussing article 3. I am going to try to confine myself to a discussion of that article. The hon. member said it was incredible that we should vote against the treaty. He could not grasp it; he could not understand it; he could not conceive how we came to do it. I am glad to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not responsible for his failure to achieve in any of these lines; it is not my fault. Of course I sympathize with him if he is in such a condition of mental or spiritual impotence that he cannot grasp the situation, but it is nothing to me.

With regard to lumber, which is mentioned here, it is true that under the treaty we get a ten per cent preference, together with an additional preference of at least six or seven per cent which comes about by reason of the exchange situation. Under those circumstances we have a good chance to compete with the United States—and the United States only—in the United Kingdom market. But we cannot compete with Norway where the exchange is against us and that is the country with which we want to compete. The hon. member for North Vancouver set the difference between Norwegian and Canadian prices at \$4 per thousand in favour of Britain buying from Norway. I have figured it out very closely, and I make it \$3 in favour of Norway as against Canada. I am leaving out and saying nothing about the heavy freight rate we must pay as compared with the freight rate from Norway. Owing to the tariff war with the United States in which we find ourselves engaged—I am not saying anything about who is to blame, though the Americans

started it—we have lost a trade in the north-western states of the union which the Prime Minister himself estimated at \$39,000,000 a year. We have lost that trade because of the \$4 duty imposed by the United States, and in return we hope to gain a portion—and it will be only a share—of the British market. I have figured out, from the figures given by the Prime Minister, that this market is worth at most \$4,000,000 a year, so you could hardly expect us to throw our hats in the air in our appreciation of a condition by which we lose a trade worth \$39,000,000 and get in return a more or less dubious chance of gaining a share, or even the whole, of a \$4,000,000 market.

Again, the hon. member stated that we were to blame because we voted against the principle of this treaty before we knew the details. I really cannot agree with him there. The right hon. Prime Minister spoke on October 12, and filled something more than one hundred columns of Hansard with his explanation of these treaties. The right hon. gentleman does understand and can explain these things; he did not mix up refined copper and concentrates, or Comox-Alberni and Kootenay. He knows what he is talking about; he explained these matters lucidly and at great length, and before that the treaties had been laid on the table. I spoke on October 25. I am not going to take time to rehash what I said then; if the hon. member for West Kootenay would like to have it I shall be glad to send him a printed copy of what I said, which he can carry around with him and dive into when opportunity offers, in early morning, at sunny noon or dewy eve. He will be able to look it over at his leisure, and perhaps when he sees what I really did say he will come around and do the prodigal son act.

I spoke thirteen days after the Prime Minister explained the matter, and in the meantime I studied the question very carefully. The only member from British Columbia who really has a right to be enthusiastic over this treaty is the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling). It certainly does affect his constituents very favourably, and if I were in his position I would have no hesitation in supporting it. The other members, however, simply spoke in the stereotyped political manner we hear every day of every session. Even the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser), generally so alert of mind and ready of tongue, had to use an alien language in order to disguise the paucity of his defence.

I said before that I carefully studied this