obligation, than that solemn we should prostitute the honor of the Crown. (Applause.) He says his policy is an Imperial policy. His policy is a bastard policy; his policy is a dishonorable policy; his policy is a policy that no honest man in this country will uphold. No matter how great his interests are, he will be ashamed, were he otherwise than animated by political bias, stand on the floor of this House and publicly advocate the breach of an honorable contract; and yet that is the doctrine that Mr. Whitney calls a Canadian and an Imperial policy.

United States Presumption. Now, I say, on behalf of ourselves, never mind the Americans; they are not a bad people, but we must do whatever we can to prevent them taking our logs, to prevent them throwing stones into our garden. They put a duty on our lumber which is very bad, and we do not like it. I am not going to say actually that we have no complaint to make or that we are not in a position to help ourselves any more than they are in a position to prevent us placing a duty on their cotton or any other article. I am not aware they challenge our right in that respect, but they, of course, attempted to get even with us, precisely what we are trying to do now, not by retaliation, but by the removal of a difficulty which they themselves have created. (Cheers.) What we do complain of in the strongest language which we can employ is not the \$2 duty, but they are not content with prescribing their own duty, they prescribe what duty we should place upon goods being exported from this country. It is that they are not content with framing their own tariff, but that they frame a tariff for us also, that we have a right to complain of; that they attempt to put a cul de sac. They prescribed a sort of automatic, self-acting coupler, attachment as it were, which went on to provide that if we impose an export duty upon our logs, in that case the duty shall be doubled; in other words, that the duty which we impose on logs shall be added to the duty they had imposed upon our sawn lumber. Let us see how that operates. Just in this way: that our lumbermen cannot get rid of their lumber, except the best quality, under a \$2 duty, and therefore it is better for them to ship their logs to the United States, where they will be sawncompelling us, as it were, to have our logs sawn in the United States. That is what I complain of. (Cheers.) We are justified in doing whatever we can do, within the bounds of the letter of the constitution, and of the contract which we have made, in seeking to get rid of it. They went further, and provided that if logs that come down the St. John River are manufactured in Canada by American lumbermen they shall be admitted into the United States free of duty. They not only prescribed in reference to our export duty, but, while sending Canadians from their shores and boundary lines, and declaring that Canadians shall not go there to work, they are saying who shall perform work in Canada. That would be a further stretch of their supposed rights in connection with our tariff than I have formerly referred to, and for these reasons we are justified in any way which is proper to get rid of that interference, and this is the best way that can be devised. (Cheers.) We should have been better satisfied if the Dominion Government had taken it up—there is no doubt of that.

The Situation Changed.

But my hon, friend from Frontenac, who made some remarks in reference to a pamphlet issued in 1894, seemed to think that we are acting somewhat inconsistently. My hon, friend did not perhaps quote the clause just as it is written. It was there pointed out that the lumber trade is of Dominion concern, not that they were alone entitled to deal with it; but because it is so big and broad that it is entitled to be treated as a Dominion concern. Then, it was, and it is, a matter of trade and commerce. The export duty is, therefore, a matter of Dominion concern, and that of trade and commerce also, so that there is nothing in the pamphlet which my hon, friend has quoted which puts us in any different position than that which we are quite willing to occupy. I may say upon that point that the situation is somewhat different now. It is very much changed and modified by those two conditions attached to the United States tariff from what it was when that pamphlet was given to the public. Therefore we may to-day be justified in doing what four or five years ago we were not justified in doing. It is only during recent years that large quantities of logs have been removed to the United States. Prior to that the quantity was inconsiderable and not of any moment. That has, however, been discussed in the House, and I need not refer to it further than to say that it is only within the last three or four years that the export of logs has risen over a hundred million feet.

A False Claim.

What I want to summarize is this. that when hon, gentlemen opposite claim this policy as their policy, they make a false claim. The Government had put their policy in motion before hon, gentlemen opposite had even taken it up seriously and introduced their resolution in this House, that we have taken the true method in a matter of this magnitude, viz., of referring it to House, and taking House and the people into confidence of the Government and securing their approval of what is being done. Upon a matter so important and grave we would not have been justified in taking action in the privacy of the Council chamber. Therefore I can hardly understand how Mr. Whitney can expect the public to sympathize with any declaration on his part that we have been guilty of a misdemeanor in bringing this matter before the House for consideration. I have not spoken with a single lumberman on the matter, even the large dealers who are anxious to press their claims to consideration. but who has said that we have adopted the truly statesmanlike course.

Mr. Hardy sat down amid vigorous Ministerial applause.

The Pork Issue.

Mr. St. John made a somewhat rambling speech. which opened with an attack on the Premier for what he