

this continent, and last year only 13 per cent was supplied by us; and as our shipments decreased the shipments from the United States have increased. Let there be no misunderstanding. I want the hon. members of this house to know that lumber is not included in the Australian treaty, and if this government were desirous of extending empire trade, why has not a treaty been negotiated with Australia to this end, or an effort made by the government to amend the present treaty so as to include manufactured lumber? A tariff revision was made by the Australian government in 1927. Among other things affected at that time were some items of lumber. Prior to this the Australian tariff board gave the lumber situation careful consideration, and after listening to all phases of the question recommended to their government a revision of the tariff on lumber and lumber products, giving a British and intermediate preference on all items. Unfortunately, this recommendation was not acted upon, but instead tariff changes were adopted with the lower schedules for British preference and with intermediate tariffs eliminated, with the result that lumber products entering Australia from Canada are just where they have always been, on the same basis as the products of the United States or Sweden. American lines of steamships running to Australia and New Zealand are now drawing direct subsidies totalling \$1,058,700. I hope that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) will note this, and will try to keep the promise he made in Vancouver, of subsidizing the vessels on the Pacific coast. The British Columbia lumber industry, as distinct from the pulp and paper industry, consists of over 1,000 firms employing over 28,000 men, with an annual pay-roll of over \$34,000,000. There is no industry in the province which is of such great importance to the public, and the lumber mills are also the greatest buyers of machinery and supplies. To-day the United States, under the cloak of mail subsidies, is building up and developing a great export trade in timber and other commodities. If the government of this country withdraw the Canadian National steamships from this service, as was intimated by the Minister of Railways according to Hansard of May 20 last, will the freight rates on the Pacific be lowered? Is it not more likely that American ship owners will raise their rates and that the ultimate result will be the complete extinction of our export trade in lumber and many other lines? Should it not be the duty of this government to meet the subsidized competition of the United States ships by taking immediate action to retain this

[Mr. Plunkett.]

trade, which is the largest in pay-rolls and money invested of all the industries of British Columbia, Vancouver Island alone having 25 per cent of the merchantable timber of Canada?

Now let us take up a concrete example of the inefficiency and lack of detail of the present government with regard to any action for the benefit or convenience of the people. Consider our currency; for over six years we have had the insufferable nuisance of two one-cent pieces and two five-cent pieces, and whom does this affect the most? It has a direct effect on the poor people of this country, and how much longer is this burden to be placed upon them? I suppose when the ministers are travelling around the country they do not bother with pennies or five-cent pieces, but the poor people have them and have had them now for over six years. I would like to ask the responsible minister why these old coins are not called in.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would say to my hon. friend that the people will have money of all kinds so long as this government remains in office.

Mr. PLUNKETT: There may be money of all kinds but it is very hard for the people to get their hands on it.

Now-a-days we do not hear very much about the reform of the senate, do we? We used to hear rumours of that in British Columbia and I expected to see all young fellows there.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is reformed now.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Perhaps so. Surely it cannot be that the Prime Minister, in view of coming events, has thoughts of the red chamber himself; surely not.

Then there is one other matter in which the government have fallen down; they always avoid any talk of the fiscal trade policy of Canada. They do not want that brought up, but I am going to bring it up to-night even though some hon. members never heard of it before. I would like the government, if they believe in the policy of free trade, to inaugurate that policy and make a test of it. The people of Canada are weary of talking about it, and as I look back over the history of the Liberal party in Canada it seems to me like Joseph's coat; it is of many colours in regard to a tariff policy. I remember them talking about free trade, then reciprocity, then commercial union and then restricted reciprocity; they ran short of names and had to start over again, but they never carry their policies into effect. They have lived under