

what, partly as a source of revenue and partly to afford reasonable protection to some industries. But now we have a direct change from all that. We have a diversion of trade, as indicated by hon. members to the left of Mr. Speaker, coupled with the provision that all other outside countries shall pay tribute if they wish to trade within the empire. Some years ago competition was considered the life of trade, and competition in those days was very necessary to trade. In my opinion it was necessary for two reasons—to keep up the quality of goods and also to keep down the price of goods to the consumer. But competition has been entirely eliminated today; tariff barriers have changed this very considerably. There is no competition in business today, at least in most modern businesses. What with trusts, combines, cartels and large companies, competition, as I say, has been entirely eliminated. And this in my opinion has been one of the contributory causes of putting wealth into the hands of the few. One could cite many instances of combinations that have eliminated all competition in the commodities used by the masses of mankind, such as aluminum, glass, soap, threads, cotton, gasoline, cement, flour and, I was almost going to say, coal. I think I will mention coal because, from the price charged here, it is evident, to me at any rate, that a combine does exist. Large concerns get around tariffs nowadays very easily; they place factories or large units in each country and ship from each of these places, thus avoiding tariff barriers or restrictions. I am not as much concerned as the Prime Minister with the fate of these industries, because their very last thought or idea is the welfare of labour or of mankind. Their very first thought, their first and only thought, is wealth—wealth for themselves.

May I say, sir, that many reports reach us in British Columbia about the solicitude of the Prime Minister with regard to trade with Russia. I have here an article which I think describes the situation fairly well. It is written by Mr. H. Napier Moore. Speaking about part of the proceedings, he says:

The ultimatum, of course, was from Mr. Bennett and required Britain to denounce her trade treaty with Russia. Mr. Moore says; "There was a scene. There was another the next day when Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Runciman and Mr. Chamberlain urged the Canadian prime minister to think of their political position at home. . . . Mr. Bennett intimated that if they were in an embarrassing position with Russia they had got themselves into it and that it was up to them to get out of it; that he had to think of his own position, too, and particularly what he deemed to be the interests of Canada."

[Mr. Reid.]

I have heard hon. members deprecate dealings with Russia. I have here an article with regard to what is transpiring at the moment in the old country:

A coincidence which can not but embarrass Conservative members of the National government was a speech last night by Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland, Labour minister in the last Conservative government, who, on returning from a visit to Russia, declares in effect his conviction that the policy now adopted is wrong, and says that much as he dislikes some aspects of the Soviet regime, he is in "favour of increasing trade with Russia as much as possible." He proceeded to express the conviction that permanence of the Soviet regime was assured and advocated not only increased trading with Russia, but assistance with the capital she urgently needed.

This is an old country authority, Conservative at that, speaking about increasing trade with Russia. He continues:

It has become immediately apparent that the government's action in denouncing the Russian agreement takes precedence over all else in public importance. Domestically there are bound to be repercussions for many thousands of workers in the industrial midlands and the north depend at present for their livelihood on Russian orders. The Labour Herald declares that nearly 50,000 would be thrown out of work in Lancashire alone if these orders ceased.

Mr. Thomas made it clear in the terms of the communication sent to Russia that Great Britain desired more trade with that country. I think that fact should be impressed upon hon. members to your right, Mr. Speaker, and especially upon the Prime Minister, who the reports say almost wept at the thought of trading with this socialist country, as he described Russia. I am not carried away with such lamentations. I find it very hard to understand how he could plead with the British delegates not to trade with Russia while at the same time negotiations were being carried on by the aluminum interests of this country for the exchange of their products for Russian oil. The statistics show that the imports of crude petroleum, not in its natural state, amounted to 4,323,515 gallons valued at over \$195,000, of which over 2,500,000 gallons valued at \$110,000 came from Russia. I wonder what the Prime Minister means by saying to Great Britain: "For heaven's sake cut off your trade with Russia," and then permitting the aluminum interests in Canada to enter into such trading negotiations. If it were coal it might not be so bad, because at the present time the consumer in Canada is being charged more for British than for American anthracite. This seems to be a deliberate hold up and steal and should be looked into. Such conditions should not be