

treaty altogether." Then it would take us a long time to get back even to the stage where we are at now.

I should like to quote again from my speech which I quoted earlier in my remarks. I said:

It may be said, and I have been accused of it before, that I have been making a protectionist speech. I care not what epithet is applied, I am only applying the principle of common sense to conditions as they happen to exist. I believe that like the Sabbath, the tariff was made for man and not man for the tariff. So much as regards the Australian treaty. My suggestions in that regard are: that we should keep the treaty for the benefit of the big industries of British Columbia and the workers thereof; that we should keep the dumping clause and strengthen it if necessary; that we should cancel the treaty as regards New Zealand. These are my own views, I think they are the views of my constituents, and I challenge any member from British Columbia to say that the carrying out of such a policy would not inure to the general benefit of the province of British Columbia.

I take the same view to-day, sir; I invite every British Columbia member to forget party politics for the time being and unite against these two amendments, the first of which proposes to do away with the treaty altogether and the other proposing to revise it under conditions which will bring about practically the same result. I think we should take this action in the interests of the industries themselves, and of the workers in these industries. I think I am able to say that I express the feelings of the various industries in the district which I represent, the feelings of the workers, of the management and of those who provide the capital when I say we do not want to do anything which will jeopardize the Australian treaty at the present time.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I should like to ask one question. The hon. gentleman stated there was a discount of six per cent with regard to Australia. Is not that in our favour and against Australia, rather than against us and in favour of Australia? That means that it costs the Australians £106 to buy £100 of British sterling.

Mr. NEILL: I am not a financial expert, but I understand that the man buying the draft has to pay the exchange, and it seems to me that if he had to pay the 6 per cent it would increase the cost to him without making any difference to us.

Mr. LADNER: I should like to ask the hon. member one question before he sits down. What harm does he see in approaching Australia with the view of getting Australia to take more lumber from British Columbia,

especially in view of the fact that recently a commission from the province visited Australia? Why does he object to an effort being made to improve that phase of the treaty?

Mr. NEILL: I take it that my hon. friend's inquiry is as to why I object to negotiating a treaty now?

Mr. LADNER: I should like to know why you object to a revision of the treaty with regard to lumber and other commodities?

Mr. NEILL: Because I suggest that present conditions are such that Australia is just itching to throw the treaty at us, and will make no revision for our benefit. If any revision is to be made it will have to be in favour of Australia. Conditions are so entirely unripe for us to ask for an increase to our own advantage; they are sore; they do not want imports; they are trying to stop them, and this is not the time for us to say, "We want more favours." The time for that is when conditions have become stabilized, when their goods are sold here and economic conditions are improved. If we do it now I fear the result will be the total elimination of the treaty for months and perhaps years.

Mr. W. T. LUCAS (Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in support of the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner), asking for the abrogation of the Australian treaty. Personally I have no objection to the making of any treaty having for its purpose the lowering of tariffs for the development of trade so long as such treaty is made on fair and equitable terms.

With regard to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), I should like to say that while I might be in sympathy with the principle involved, that of negotiating a new treaty with our sister dominion on fair and equitable terms, under the circumstances I have no option but to vote against it just as on similar occasions we have been obliged to vote against similar amendments, because if we voted for the subamendment we would be precluded from voting for our own amendment, which I think is of primary importance at the present time. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Acadia were adopted it would not prevent this government from doing what is suggested in the subamendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Australian treaty was not negotiated on fair and equitable terms; agriculture was singled out and