

not speaking of immigration, but as president of the Alberta wheat pool he was dealing with the question of an export duty on wheat:

To me the greatest peril that we are facing immediately, and it will be the most infamous crime that was ever committed in the country in my opinion, and that is an export duty on our wheat. Now that thing is very, very visible on the horizon just now.

An export duty means just one thing, it means—and it don't mean anything else—that we go down in our pockets, or we don't because the money never gets to our pockets; but we pay just so many cents a bushel to the Canadian millers on every bushel of wheat that we raise in Canada.

Robbery, yes a straight unqualified theft, but done through legislation. Now we had some very valuable advice yesterday about not going to the government to get the government to solve our problems for us. "Attend to your own business," and that was as good advice as we ever had. But that advice would be infinitely more valuable to Canada and to humanity if it were given to other people as well as us. Now we are inviting immigration to this country and it is beginning to look like we could honestly do so, because I am not sure they would not be able to make a living here if things go on as they have been going. But suppose we say to them, "If you come to these great wheat fields of western Canada and begin to raise this wheat, in addition to all the natural difficulties that exist, we would expect you to pay to the milling industry of Canada 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 10 cents a bushel on all the wheat you raise." Do you suppose they would come? If they do they would be of such mental calibre that we would not want them.

Now, that don't only mean that they want to take anywhere from five to forty million of dollars a year out of the wheat producers of Canada, but it means also that they want to create a false position where it will be necessary to maintain that and to increase it.

I heard a manufacturer on the train the other day. In the smoking compartment, where all the problems of the nation are solved—who told about when Grover Cleveland was President of the United States they reduced the tariff on certain things and put certain industries out of business.

I am satisfied that that was true. I don't know the details. But why did it put them out of business? Because they (the manufacturing industry) had been built upon an absolutely false basis. That false basis was created by legislation, and when you begin to remove that false scaffolding and let it down to an honest, true basis, it could not stand; it had all been falsely developed.

Now to put five or ten cents a bushel export duty on Canadian wheat, and instead of having a milling capacity of 90,000,000 bushels as they milled last year, you will soon have developed a milling capacity of 350,000,000 bushels and you cannot sustain that without a continued theft from the producer. They will ask for increases, saying, "Here is a great industry that we have built up here and must be sustained."

Now I only want to say one thing more. We want to fight this infernal thing to the death, with every means at our command.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. LUCAS: I ask the hon. gentleman to let me finish the statement, there are only a few more words:

And if we cannot successfully fight it any other way, we must appeal to the emigrants of every country in the world, "For God's sake don't come here and get involved in this infamous thing."

It will be evident from the quotation from the speech of Mr. Wood which I have read that his remarks had nothing whatever to do with immigration.

Mr. DAVIS: I desire to state that the quotation I used was taken from the Calgary Herald of January 20 last and was published on the first page of that paper. If my hon. friend will look at the revised Hansard he will see that the source of the quotation is given.

Mr. LUCAS: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. As I have already said his whole speech was couched in a very fair manner; I feel that he did not want to be unfair. However, the report of his remarks in unrevised Hansard did not give the authority for his quotation, and I simply took the opportunity to present the correct information as I have it here. Had the hon. gentleman stated in the first place that the quotation he gave was taken from a paper it would have relieved him from responsibility.

Let me now deal for a few minutes with the Australian treaty. While that treaty is not specifically mentioned in the amendment before the House there is no doubt it is one of the treaties under fire at the present time. When the treaty was brought down I felt that it was unfair, especially to the agriculturists of Canada. I may say that I listened with a great deal of interest to the figures given by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) the other night as showing the trade between Canada and Australia. Those figures are as follows:

	Imports from Australia	Exports to Australia
1917..	\$ 762,113	\$ 6,549,546
1919..	4,963,446	14,019,629
1920..	1,371,775	11,415,623
1921..	791,980	18,112,861

A question that has occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, is, why we were concerned about going down to Australia to secure a treaty at all. The foregoing figures would indicate that Australia was the one that should have been concerned about sending representatives to Canada for that purpose. Seeing that Australia was not worried about the existing trade conditions I do not think it was wise for Canada to negotiate a treaty with that country especially when in order to make a bargain, the agricultural industry had to be sacrificed to such an extent. We feel as producers that we have been hit in two ways. An import duty of three cents a pound was placed on raisins, which means raising the price to us as consumers, and then the duty was taken off the products we had to sell; in that way we have been hit both going and coming. The