

a pastry flour which requires a soft wheat. We can get that just a few miles across the border in Washington, but owing to the tariff situation it is more profitable for us to send to Australia for that soft wheat. So it is with lumber. The United States, in the course of this merry game of throwing the cat backward and forward, imposed on our lumber a duty of \$4 a thousand. It absolutely killed our trade. In a town near where I live a mill was running, in spite of all the depression, two shifts a day, and they had to shut down absolutely; and there are others in the same position. Now we are going to try to force open a market seven thousand miles away, with a handicap of \$12 a thousand on the transportation of lumber, and with a people who really do not want our lumber. What they want is first-class, not second-class lumber; they require lumber cut in a certain way in which we as a rule do not cut it, and which involves our installing expensive machinery which we shall not use part of the time when we are cutting for our own domestic market. But we have to do all these things to try to get our lumber into a market that does not want it. We have lost a market in the northwest United States worth \$39,000,000 a year, and in return we hope to capture a share of the lumber shipped from the United States Pacific seaboard to Britain the total value of which does not exceed \$4,000,000 annually. In a case like that would it not be better to have a little reciprocity, I might say a little common sense? The American farmer in the northwest wants our lumber, and Canada is the only place where he can handily get his supply. The American timber man wants to ship his hardwood into Ontario. So why not have a little reciprocity and accomplish the two things together? Perhaps after next month it will be easier to have a little reciprocity with our neighbours to the south.

Now I come to fish. We are also unsuccessful about that. The canneries as far back as last April said that they wanted a specific duty, that that was the thing that would suit them best in dealing with competition from Japan. They did not get it; I do not know why. They got a ten per cent duty while they expected a twenty per cent duty. A duty of ten per cent is very small. There is need for a specific duty or a higher ad valorem duty in order that we may meet the unfair competition from Japan and the soviet republic. This ten per cent that we have been granted will enable us to compete successfully with the United States in Great Britain because in addition to the ten per cent duty we have

[Mr. Neill.]

the advantage of the exchange situation. But we cannot compete against Japan, whose yen is very much depreciated at the present time, and article 21 does not apply to that situation at all. Possibly we might get more help than we can get by tinkering with the whole list of tariffs if we put a check on the unscrupulous labelling of salmon tins. Quite recently a large quantity of our third best variety salmon was shipped to Australia and labelled as such, but when it arrived there the labels were taken off and were replaced by others indicating that the salmon was the first variety. That will hurt our trade very much, and that is the fault of the present government. Last year I protested against the regulations that were put in force governing the inspection of salmon. They were a travesty on common sense and exhibited a minimum of efficiency; in fact, no efficiency at all. That led them to label the tins. What they should have done, and they will have to come to this yet, is to provide for the embossing in the tin itself of three words: First, Canada—they have that now; second, the variety—sockeye or chum, etc.; so there can be no deception; third, the grade, whether it is standard or choice. But none of these things can be done under the present foolish regulations. I predict, however, that even this year the regulations will have to be changed. That would help to stop this Jap competition. The ten per cent duty will not help us against the Japs, but it will against the United States.

Here is another little item in British Columbia that could be helped along without applying tariffs at all. The British Columbia fisherman fishes in territorial waters off the coast in competition with the American. He gets halibut and a certain grade of salmon called springs. The best market for both these fish is the United States. There is a duty of two cents a pound against our fish entering the United States, and consequently our fishermen have to take two cents a pound less than the Americans who use our ports. That is rather galling. That also calls for a little reciprocity. The present Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) when he was Minister of Fisheries took a keen interest in this question and promised to take it up at Washington. Had he retained that portfolio I have no doubt he would have done so, but the fisheries have been placed in the hands of a man who knows as much about fish as we know about who is the vice prime minister of Italy, we will say. Nothing has been done, and I predict that nothing will be done under the present incumbent of the ministry of fisheries. The government have made a treaty with the United