

ency with me; it never was. I am thoroughly convinced of the justice of the claim of the lumbermen of British Columbia. I am arguing this from strong convictions that I have on the subject myself. I told my people some years ago and I have continued to tell them that it was a position that I thought must sooner or later be dealt with by the government and the grievance remedied. The government have had delegations wait upon them in reference to this matter. Probably the largest, most representative and most influential of these delegations waited upon them during the present session of parliament. I had the pleasure of introducing the members of that delegation, along with my colleagues from British Columbia, to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Customs, and probably one or two other ministers. I believe I am not going outside the book when I say that the ministers who listened to the full arguments of those in the delegation felt impressed with the strength of their argument and the justness of their cause; I believe they did so. Evidently, however, even if I am right in assuming that the arguments made a strong impression on the ministers of the justness of their requests and of their cause, the government have not seen fit to make that one of the items to be dealt with at the present session of parliament. The reason I presume is that this is a question that is more or less far-reaching and one which they felt they would be justified in postponing until the meeting of the tariff commission to inquire into the tariff generally and to deal with that matter as with other matters. I cannot say that I agree with the stand taken by the government with regard to that. That is not saying that the government's stand is not right, but my view of it is that it is not a case where the lumbermen of British Columbia are asking for an increase in tariff at all; it is a case where the lumbermen of British Columbia—and I may say the lumbermen from Ontario and the maritime provinces and some from the Northwest Territories who were present in the delegation and were all unanimous in their requests—it was not a case of their coming and saying: We have a certain duty upon lumber that is not sufficient and we want you to increase it. The position is this, that on rough lumber entering Canada there is no duty at all, and this is where that falls most heavily. The provision in the Tariff Act, passed, I think, in 1904 the dumping clause, applies only to dutiable goods except, I think, with one slight exception. In our market for British Columbia lumber, namely, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, American lumber manufacturers, especially during the years of depression in building in the United States, find that they can dispose only of a portion, probably a considerable portion, of their products in the United States trade and to United States buyers. The balance

Mr. GALLIHER

of their lumber is on their hands and they wish to get rid of it. The result is that with good freight rates, in order to get rid of their stock, they put it on the market, particularly in Manitoba and in some portions of the Northwest Territories at prices below what they will sell at in their own country and below what the British Columbia lumber manufacturer can sell at; yet we cannot apply the penalty contained in this dumping clause to this case because there is no duty upon rough lumber. We find that condition facing us more particularly in years when the building trade is not over active in the country to the south of us, and it is as much to prevent this very dumping of lumber at what we call slaughter prices upon our own market as anything else that we desire a duty to be placed on rough lumber. Of course opposed to this proposition we have always found our friends from the Northwest Territories and the province of Manitoba more particularly, and I am not attaching any blame to hon. members from that province with regard to that further than that I do not think they are taking exactly a fair view as between province and province.

Take the new province of Alberta; take that tract of country bordering British Columbia on the east; British Columbia provides for the Territory the natural market for its farm, its ranch and its dairy products, and the greater the lumbering industry of British Columbia the greater will be our purchases in the Northwest Territories. In addition a great deal of employment is given to the citizens of these Territories working in our lumber camps. Practically all the supplies used by these lumber camps: meats, eggs, butter, hay, grain, are the products of the ranches and farms of the Northwest, and all of these products are more or less reasonably protected by the tariff. We contend that as our neighbours to the east are enabled to supply our market with their protected products; they in turn should not object to a protective duty on the rough lumber of British Columbia which now comes into competition with American free lumber. It has been said, and for the sake of argument I will admit it—although the British Columbia lumber manufacturers will not agree with me—that the people of the Northwest would have to pay a little more for their lumber if a duty of \$2 were imposed. But, Sir, we must all recognize that certain parts of our Dominion are so situated geographically, that they are bound to pay higher prices for articles which they themselves do not produce than do other portions of the Dominion. In British Columbia we have to pay more for the goods we consume and which are not produced within our boundaries than have the provinces to the east. That is because of the higher freight rates which we have to pay on goods sent to our distant province. Manitoba and the Northwest Territories are not lumber