

The United States is a combination of some 49 states with a tariff wall around them, and the utmost freedom of trade amongst them; they can manufacture and practically produce within their wide area most of the things that can be manufactured and produced in the rest of the world. The same thing is equally true of our own union, but we do not seem to get very far in developing inter-imperial trade. In dealing with our neighbours in the matter of trade, it is a matter of barter, while with the United Kingdom, it should be approached from the point of view of maintaining the integrity of our commonwealth.

I hold that the work of this Commission in its report upon the development of the St Lawrence River, is one of the greatest things that has been done for Canada in recent years. Now I know that that is not the point of view in Montreal. My idea is that our report has given Canada that opportunity which is necessary in bartering for an expansion of our trade with the United States. In other words, it is the agency for bartering which Canada might very properly employ.

I believe in a reasonable tariff for Canada. Canada is not the pace-maker in tariffs. That is the privilege of her neighbour. I do not think, however, that the pulling out of the few bricks in the tariff wall by Mr King is in any way responsible for Canada's unsatisfactory position to-day.

We are at the present time sending into the United States about \$600,000,000 yearly for the products of that country, while it is sending us roughly about \$400,000,000 for ours. \$200,000,000 of the latter is for lumber and wood products. The average Canadian lumberman will tell us that in twenty-five years our timber resources will have been pretty well exhausted, not so much on account of the activities of the lumberman but through the ravages of forest fires.

Provincial governments are being forced to the four corners of their provinces to collect revenue, and in order to meet their expenditures they are unable to return to the forests a sufficient proportion of the money that they take out of them in order to safeguard them from destruction by fire. In consequence the annual loss is measured in millions. Unless that policy can be changed, in twenty years we will have to send something else to our neighbours, otherwise the balance of trade against us will be more than it is to-day.

Returning to the question of tariff, the United States does not seem to have any fixed principle. They tell us if we allow their coal to come in to this country free of duty, they will allow ours to go into their territory on the same terms. Then they go to the other extreme and adopt an adjustable tariff in respect to our wheat, which allows the President to raise or lower the bars as he sees fit. We have in western Canada considerable discontent over railway freight rates. We have more or less discontent in the Maritime Provinces. My point of