

a place where you can keep money safely. I think he might as well say that the ocean is a splendid place to keep water wet. Well, an hon. gentleman who has that conception of finance may have any kind of conception about trade. There is no such thing as a favourable balance of trade; apart from the expressions of the minister it has no meaning in so far as Canada is concerned—none whatsoever. He leaves out, I say, in his first list of figures the New Zealand part, but brings it in later and points out that during the period of the trade arrangement with that country we bought nearly \$40,000,000 of goods: Now, a \$40,000,000 market to the dairy industry of Canada during the last few months would have been of very great importance. We cannot disregard a market of that extent so carelessly as the Minister appears to do. However, the ultimatum has gone forth: Nothing shall be considered in the way of abrogating this treaty; the amount purchased from Australia and New Zealand at the expense of the agricultural industry of Canada does not matter; let it be known that certain great industries of Canada have benefited by the sacrifice of the agricultural industry; therefore the treaty must be continued.

I can understand the position of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). He makes it clear without any equivocations at all. There are certain industries benefited by this treaty, and they happen to be in his province. Naturally he speaks for them. I disagree with him, however, when he points out that the amendment is a want of confidence in the government. The amendment is a want of confidence in the Australian treaty. So far as I am concerned, I am quite willing to vote want of confidence in the Australian treaty, and the next moment vote that this government stay where it is until the proper time, 1931, and then go to the people again. I am not seeking to defeat the government. I am seeking to express lack of confidence in the Australian treaty, and to that extent the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni were beside the point. He is very much interested apparently in what Australia may think about what we say regarding the treaty; he is not so much interested in the farmers who are suffering because of it.

Now, the Australian treaty of course is an agreement made in respect of trade between the governments of Canada and Australia, an agreement mutually arrived at. On the one hand, Australia agreed to reduce tariff on certain commodities imported from Canada; in return Canada agreed to reduced tariffs on certain commodities coming into Canada from

Australia. Our government at that time was in a rather difficult political position. Having been elected on a platform of tariff reduction, revision of the tariff downwards with a view to free trade, it was of course anxious to get some excuse that could be used in election time as pointing towards specific tariff reductions. At the same time the government was being pressed by certain industries for an increase of tariff. So the Australian treaty appeared as a solvent of this political puzzle, for the advantages given to our protected interests were equivalent to increases in the tariff; and the reductions which were made on commodities produced by a class that has expressed itself in favour of tariff reduction. Therefore the government said; These people, the farmers, want tariff reduction; we will give them tariff reduction; they have four per cent protection on butter, we will reduce it to one cent and see how they like free trade when they get it; and in return for that we will secure further privileges in foreign markets for our manufacturers who already are protected very highly in Canada. Thus they placed the farmer at a greater disadvantage than before, because in exchanging his product of butter for commodities manufactured by our protected industries he would have three cents a pound disadvantage greater than previously. So the government when it is asked at the next election: "How much have you reduced the tariff; were you not elected to do that?" must reply to the farmers: "We reduced the tariff three cents a pound on butter coming from Australia."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I am not asking for the abrogation of the Australian treaty on the ground that Australia got a better bargain than we did. So far as the two countries are concerned the bargain may be fair; I have not gone into that phase of the matter. I am objecting to the treaty because it implies class discrimination, as the treaty affects certain classes in Canada.

That is the basis of our objection to it, and apparently that point escaped the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) yesterday, when he extolled the treaty because it increased trade and especially because it increased the sale of nails and fish in the maritime provinces. I wonder whether, in the early period of our industrial development, when child labour was in vogue, it could not have been said that child labour increased trade, but what a standard of statesmanship that is. If the manufacturers of the maritime provinces are so anxious to increase trade, let them reduce the price of their nails. They can give nails away, if they wish, and