

*Australian Treaty—Mr. Lucas*

discriminated against in order to benefit industry generally. I presume in making any treaty it is necessary to adopt a give and take attitude, but in this case agriculture was asked to give all and take nothing. As a class the farmers are not antagonistic to industry, but we do believe that industry should be able to stand on its own feet. Personally I believe that Canada must be developed in no lopsided fashion, but that our basic industry of agriculture and the other great industries should be developed uniformly in the progress of the country. If, in order to develop industry generally, it must be allowed to ride on the backs of the farmers of this country, who are already bearing an overload, then I am absolutely opposed to any such practice.

In this treaty there is not one single thing which benefits the farmer; he gets no advantages in Australia or New Zealand, but is subjected to keen competition with the products of these countries in his own markets. We find that in order to negotiate this treaty the tariff on farm products was reduced; the tariff on fresh meats was reduced from 3 cents per pound to one-half cent; on eggs from 2 cents a dozen to free; on butter from 4 cents per pound to one cent; on honey from 3 cents to free; on tomatoes and vegetables from one and a half cents to free, and changes were made with regard to other commodities as well.

Some hon. members in this house representing agriculture have taken the stand that protection does not benefit the farmer. I am free to admit that under the general principle of protection the farmer does not gain the benefit which is afforded industry generally, but on those commodities in which the farmer is not on an export basis I am of the opinion that he does get a benefit. Evidently Australia had the same opinion; she accepted our manufactured products provided she could get her agricultural products into Canada, and therefore she must have thought it would be an advantage to her farmers.

I find that not only are the dairy farmers complaining; I have received letters from the Southern Alberta Sheep Breeders' Association and from the Western Live Stock Growers' Association, which I will not take time to read because I presume other hon. members have received copies also. However, they go on to point out the increasing importations not only of dairy products but also of mutton and beef into this country from Australia and New Zealand. We find that the United States tariff is being raised to such an extent as practically to close those markets not only to Canada but to the world at large,

[Mr. Lucas.]

which means that we will be shut out of the markets in the United States which we have enjoyed in the past, and from the increased importations into Canada from New Zealand and Australia in the last year it would seem that these two countries have been preparing for this condition and have been trying to develop a market in Canada. Therefore, now that the United States tariff has been increased, we may expect further increases in the products imported into Canada from Australia and New Zealand.

It is true that wheat has been the chief product of western Canada, but I think every hon. member realizes that the future for wheat growing is none too promising. As the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) pointed out yesterday in his very able speech, during the last five years the wheat acreage of the four great wheat producing countries has increased by 20,000,000 acres, and in addition we find that the European countries, because of their economic conditions and in order to avoid sending money out of their countries, which they cannot afford to do, are making every effort to stimulate production within their own boundaries. I should like to give the tariffs imposed by these countries against the importation of wheat. As we know, the United States tariff is 42 cents per bushel; in France it is 53 cents; in Germany 61½ cents, and in Italy 73 cents. In addition we find that French millers are compelled to use 97 per cent of domestic wheat in making flour, and in Germany the millers are compelled to use 50 per cent of their own wheat. Further than that, these countries give a bonus on the export of wheat, so under these circumstances what are the future prospects of Canadian wheat being able to find a ready market in these countries?

In these circumstances the natural tendency is to turn more and more to mixed farming. Only a few days ago we were given to understand that the Department of Agriculture had called a conference of farmers from various parts of Canada to discuss a production campaign. I believe the opinion of the farmers to be that while they are ready to do everything to increase production, they are becoming discouraged. They cannot help thinking, "What is the use of producing unless we are sure that we are going to get at least the cost of production out of it," and when they find their own markets left open to the dumping of the same commodities from all parts of the world, it is hard to get them to undertake a larger production campaign at the present time. They feel they should at least have some preference in their own markets.