

*Australian Treaty—Mr. Lucas*

Mr. LUCAS: The hon. member can obtain that information by reference to the votes and proceedings. My hon. friend seemed to be bitterly disappointed about hon. members in this section of the house sacrificing their principles, and yet I find that he is supporting a government which is taxing the people on other commodities of life just as essential as is butter. What has he done to have the tariff reduced on wearing apparel, boots and shoes, and things of that kind which are absolute necessities. We have a tariff of 30 per cent on boots and shoes, 30 per cent on clothing, 35 per cent on woollen goods—surely the people of western Canada require woollen clothing—30 per cent on furniture and 35 per cent on enamel ware.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the Consumers' League support those tariffs?

Mr. LUCAS: It is evidently supporting the government which keeps those tariffs in effect.

Mr. STEVENS: That is terrible.

Mr. LUCAS: I believe that the representatives of western Canada all have been sincere in advocating lower tariffs and freer trade, and yet they sit in with and take responsibility for a government which has not been able to reduce those tariffs. Is it any wonder that the farmers of Canada are losing hope of obtaining any reduction?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): At least we have not come to the point where we ask the government to increase the duties.

Mr. STEVENS: The government does it.

An hon. MEMBER: What about raisins?

Mr. LUCAS: I would like to call attention also to the composition of the cabinet.

Mr. STEVENS: Where are they?

Mr. LUCAS: In that cabinet are four outstanding men from western Canada who I believe are sincere and who possess ability, and of that four, two were former leaders of the Progressive movement. One would think that when those men got into the cabinet there would have been some lowering of the tariff.

In my opinion the proper way to deal with this question is to adopt a common sense attitude. I heard a very prominent gentleman from western Canada, a strong advocate of free trade, state that he was convinced that if we were going to hold confederation together we would have to have a tariff in this country. When one looks over the rates of duties imposed by Canada from confederation down to the present time, it will be found that the rate of duty has remained fairly stationary, but for the information of my

[Mr. E. J. Young.]

hon. friends I would tell them that it is to-day a little higher than it was when the present government came into office. To save the putting of these figures on Hansard, I would refer hon. members to pages 10, 11 and 12 of Trade of Canada. It will be a good education for them to look over those figures, because they will find that the average rate of duty has remained almost static since confederation, irrespective of which party has been in power.

Mr. BROWN: The average rate.

Mr. LUCAS: The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) would be very glad to use these rates, to show that high tariffs existed under other governments.

Mr. BROWN: The hon. member for Lisgar is not guilty of basing his argument upon averages.

Mr. IRVINE: He had better not.

Mr. LUCAS: I am of the opinion that the farmers still believe in the principle of free trade; I believe in that principle myself, but if we are going to have tariff then let it be administered fairly. It has been stated that we were breaking one of the planks in the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture.

I would like to suggest that there was also in that platform a plank on prohibition and yet we find to-day two farmer governments in western Canada are administering liquor laws. Nevertheless I believe the farmers of western Canada are just as strong to-day as ever in favour of prohibition but because of the situation they find this the most practical way to deal with the matter.

Mr. BROWN: Is the hon. member aware that those laws were brought in by referendum of the people?

Mr. DUNNING: The debate has wandered far afield from the amendment and subamendment before the house. When it reaches prohibition, I think it is time to raise a point of order.

Mr. LUCAS: It was just on account of criticisms which have been levelled against this group that I was developing my argument along those lines.

Mr. STEVENS: It is going home, all right.

Mr. LUCAS: Yes. I should like to give another illustration. I believe the hon. gentlemen—and I was one of them—who voted the other night to establish a divorce court in Ontario, were just as much opposed to the principle of divorce and just as much in favour