

are bringing in no revenue. The cry of the opponents of free trade is: "Conserve them, conserve them for our future generations." It is an argument without foundation to say conserve what you cannot consume or hope to consume for perhaps centuries to come.

Wood as fuel has largely given way to gas and electricity. Lumber, like stone, for construction purposes, has been of late years largely replaced by cement. Is it not altogether probable that science will soon discover some substitute for wood in the manufacture of paper, and then our immense pulpwood areas will be of little value.

Canada desires to find larger markets for her products. She is doing that all the time, she is sending her commercial agents to the utmost ends of the earth to seek for business, entailing a cost of \$3,000,000 per year. Why not seek it from the 93,000,000 of people that live side by side with her?

Would Unrestricted Reciprocity destroy the manufacturing industry? By no means. It would place it on a more solid foundation. The Canadian manufacturers fearing the possibility of being obliged to be satisfied with reasonable profits as a result of outside competition, can see nothing but blue ruin if the tariff wall that protects their high prices is removed. It is the immense profits that protection has permitted the manufacturers to squeeze out of the Canadian consumers that has enabled them to carry on a colossal newspaper campaign against the acceptance by Canada of the Taft-Fielding agreement. Their organs clamor for protective duties on foreign products, but are not particularly friendly to the notion of taxes on the raw material they themselves use. They want their own industry protected, while anxious that free trade shall rule in every other department. It never seems to strike them that if protection be started it must be extended to all commodities and embrace all interests. It never seems to strike them that to protect one interest to the exclusion of the rest is to commit a gross injustice. It never seems to occur to them that the interests or supposed interests of a class may be incompatible with, or directly opposed to, the interests of the community. They never seem to truly estimate such an elementary principle as this: that however large and prosperous a class may be, it forms only a part and is not the whole nation. The Canadian manufacturer has been unduly protected against the American manufacturer,—a protective tariff of 45% being given to him,—with the result that our Canadian manufacturers form a monopoly with the people as their victims.