

Parliament have been concerned. It has been dealt with by the Dominion Parliament on more than one occasion as a matter affecting the trade and

commerce of the country generally, which properly and naturally belongs to the Dominion to deal with, different Provinces having different interests and circumstances varying in different parts of the Dominion, and international questions of trade being more or less involved. I may perhaps refer to what has been done during the past 30 years by the Dominion Parliament and Government in connection with the export of sawlogs. The Canadian Parliament in 1866 fixed an export duty on sawlogs of \$1 per thousand feet board measure. That remained, I believe, the law of the land for a very long period—I think about twenty years. In 1886 the Dominion Parliament increased the export duty to \$2 per 1,000 feet, and by the same measure the Dominion Government were authorized by order in Council to increase it to \$3 per thousand if thought expedient. Then in 1888 the Dominion Government were authorized by the Dominion Parliament, whenever it was deemed to be advisable in the public interests, to reduce or remove the export duty on sawlogs. The form of that act goes to show that the Dominion Parliament seemed to charge itself with the responsibility of dealing with the export of logs whenever from time to time it might be deemed expedient in the interests of the country either to reduce or increase the duty. Under and in pursuance of the powers given by acts of Parliament the Dominion Government have acted by order in Council. On Nov. 13, 1888, under the act of 1888, the export duty was increased to \$3 per thousand feet board measure. Then again in 1889, by order in Council, the duty was reduced to \$2 per thousand feet board measure, and on Nov. 11, 1890, a further order in Council was passed entirely removing the export duty, so that it will be seen that during the five years from 1886 to 1890 the Dominion Government as a Government dealt with this question no less than five different times. Now many of the previous changes which have been made have been reciprocal changes; there has been in a sense a measure of reciprocity between the two countries with reference to the duties on lumber exported to the United States and the duty on logs going from this country into the United States. One thing is certain—the policy of the Dominion Government was to remove restrictions upon the export of logs when the American Government removed the barriers against the importation of lumber, and doubtless acting for, representing or voicing the sentiments of the lumbermen generally, and doubtless acting in the best interests of the country at large, they would have been content, whether Conservative or Liberal, for all time to come to refrain from imposing an export duty upon sawlogs—(hear, hear)—as long as pine lumber continued to be admitted free, or perhaps admitted at the moderate rate of duty of \$1 per thousand into the United States.

It was always considered, and I would suppose that anyone who is fa-

miliar with the subject at all will admit that there is more money for the country in a free export of lumber or manufactured timber, from this country into the United States than there would be by the imposition of any duty upon the export of the unmanufactured material. That seems to have been the view by which the Parliament of Canada and the Dominion Government have been actuated and I have no doubt that is the correct view so far as this country is concerned, in realizing on the products of our forests, whether they be pine timber, cedar, tamarack or any other variety of our timber resources.

Canadians at a Disadvantage.

Now, the position was as I have described up to a recent date, when the bill known as the Dingley bill was passed by the American Congress, imposing a duty of \$2 per thousand upon lumber going into the United States from this country. That was, of course, a reversal of the policy of the previous Administration, and naturally a very important change in policy. But the feature of that legislation, Mr. Speaker, which has caused the trouble, which has caused irritation in this country and which has called public attention very pointedly to this question, is what is called the automatic attachment of the Dingley bill—(hear, hear)—namely, the provision by which, if this country imposes an export duty of any kind upon timber or sawlogs going into the United States, the duty of \$2 per thousand upon lumber, by reason of that, ipso facto, there springs into existence an additional duty equal to whatever may be imposed as export duty by Canada upon the raw material going in. In other words, if this country imposes in a reciprocal way an export duty of \$2 per M on the raw material going into the United States, immediately the barrier against lumber going into the United States springs from \$2 to \$4 per thousand and becomes prohibitory. Now the effect of that is that while our mills or lumbermen after manufacturing their logs into lumber and taking that lumber to the American market are charged \$2 per thousand, the Michigan lumbermen who tow the logs over to the American side and manufacture them into lumber in their mills there have an absolute advantage of \$2 per M over their Canadian competitors. (Hear, hear.) This is a very much more important matter than on the face of it will appear. Although the mere statement of this fact alone shows the hardship, when it is stated that the lower grades of lumber and the refuse, the odds and ends, all the cheap and comparatively valueless material which in the face of the \$2 per M duty cannot be taken to the American market and sold at more than cost, if even at that, on free access to the American side, the same classes of lumber manufactured at the American mills can be made the subject of very considerable profit, and that is a point which I believe hon. gentlemen who are familiar with these matters will consider one of very great importance indeed. (Applause.)