

producing and naturally they must expect to pay a higher price for lumber than is paid in the lumber producing provinces. That is a natural sequence of our extensive territory and our geographical position. In the same way the people of British Columbia have to pay more for the products which they get from other parts of Canada than do the people in the eastern provinces. I am satisfied that when the tariff commissioners have taken all the facts into consideration, they will say that the case of the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia is a just case and that it should be acceded to by this government and this parliament. The argument has been advanced in former sessions of this parliament, that we should not impose any duty on lumber because it is one of the requirements of the new settler whom we should induce by all means to come to our country. I am in accord with that idea, but let us consider just to what extent a new settler would be affected even if he had to pay \$2 more per thousand feet for his lumber by reason of a duty. The average settler who comes in practically without means, will not within the first three years require more than 10,000 feet of lumber, and at \$2 per thousand it would mean all told \$20. Of course \$20 is \$20 to a settler, but let us be fair. Let us look at all the rest of the things which that same settler has to get when he comes in the country. He has to have clothes to wear, farming implements to till his land, household furniture for his home, and a hundred and one necessities of life. Single out any one of these articles that is free of duty. On all of them he has to pay duty, but his lumber is free. Whatever force there might have been in that argument some years ago, let me point out that it is not applicable now, for this reason: of the 65,000,000 feet of lumber that came from the United States to Manitoba and the Territories last year, only about 5,000,000 feet went into the portions of the Territories where the new settlers are going; the balance was used in the cities and in the reasonably well-to-do farming ranching communities of southern Manitoba. As settlement goes further back less and less American lumber will each year go into these new tracts of country, and so I say that whatever there was in that argument years ago, there is very little if any force in it now.

It was charged that we were not entitled to relief because a combine existed among the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia. Well, now, it is a moot point between Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia, as to who was responsible for that. It is a question I am not going to argue to-night, because, if any grievance did exist against the manufacturers of British Columbia of that kind, that grievance has absolutely and entirely ceased now, because there is no combine. Now, I have spoken as long as I intended to. I have merely referred to this lumber question to

place myself on record in this House. I know that I have placed myself on record before the members of the government. I know it is not a new thing for them to hear what I have said, but I want my constituents, and I want the people of British Columbia generally to understand that in so far as obtaining for them what I consider to be their just and proper due, that is relief for the lumber industry, I am heart and soul with them, and I intend to continue the good work, to do as I have done in the past, to do that which one man can reasonably be expected to do in order to bring about that result, and to get for them the adjustment of the duty on rough lumber that I think they are entitled to. In that respect I may say that I have been ably aided by the members from British Columbia as a whole. Now, I will conclude my remarks, begging pardon for obtruding myself into this debate and begging pardon of myself for having put myself up against the proposition of talking on such a hot night as this, but I felt I had a duty to perform, a duty to my constituents and a duty to myself, and I hope therefore that I may be pardoned for having troubled the House with the few remarks which it has been my privilege to offer.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John city). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this late hour in the evening, and also at this late period in the session, and especially under these very oppressive atmospheric conditions that we are suffering from now, to inflict anything at all like a speech on the House. We have heard to-night references made to the lumber, mineral, agricultural and manufacturing industries and interests in this country. I want also to make a reference to the maritime and shipping interest. The fact that I do not intend to occupy the time of the House to any extent, I think, will be shown when I state that I merely wish to refer to a statement and to what I think is an omission of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). The statement to which I wish to refer was made at the last session of parliament, and the omission to which I refer was, I think, made to-day in the delivery of the budget speech. Those of us who were present at the last session of parliament will remember that somewhere in the middle of June a motion was introduced by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), for the cause of whose long continued absence from this House, I am sure, we are all very sorry, and who, under these circumstances, has our sincere sympathy. He made a motion to this effect:

That in the opinion of this House the preferential tariff should only apply to importations through Canadian ports.

In speaking to this motion he referred to the very many resolutions that had been adopted in support of it by boards of trade in the maritime provinces, and also by a con-