

they have the power by regulation to do almost the equivalent of imposing an export duty. They cannot do it in the form of a duty, but they can so legislate that they can check the exportation to any extent they wish. They can establish such restrictions as to the terms and conditions upon which they will grant their leases, or their timber rights, as will amount to the equivalent of an export duty. Then, a great deal of the land, notably in the province from which my hon. friend comes, is held by private owners and for these owners it is a great privilege to be allowed to sell their pulp wood to the best buyers and they therefore fear that if we had an export duty—I am only stating what is their argument—the manufacturers of Canada who use pulp wood would be disposed to pay a less price than they pay today, and that a restriction imposed upon the small holder, as to how he shall deal with his own wood, would have the effect of giving him a less favourable price than that which he now receives. I am not saying that that would be the conclusion but I am putting before the committee the reasons which have been given against such a policy. There is a great deal to be said on both sides, it is a large question and I do not do more than attempt to-night to put the other side of the question since my hon. friend has put his side of it.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the argument which my hon. friend presents very well. With all respect for the people whom he mentions I must say that I look at the question in a national way. This is a matter which does not only affect the province of Quebec from which this pulp wood is exported but which affects the whole country. I am told that there is a good deal of pulp wood exported also from New Brunswick. Speaking for myself I do not believe that if this policy were adopted the price would go down. The manufacturers in Canada would have to buy the pulp wood. We are selling part of our national assets by sending this pulp wood to the United States. I do not see why we should not have as much patriotism as they have in that country. They have some pulp wood there but they do not cut it. They want to preserve it as long as possible. Therefore, they come here for their supply of pulp wood. The supply will not last for ever, and therefore I think that the policy pursued by the provincial government in my own province, contrary to the one pursued in another province that my hon. friend spoke of, is an unwise one. Of course we have nothing to say as to that, but it is within the power of the Dominion government to impose an export duty upon pulp wood. Suppose for a year or two that the price of pulp wood were diminished I think that in the long run it would be restored and a greater advantage would accrue to this country than that which is now derived from the export of pulp wood. We would be manufacturing

the paper here. We have an immense amount of that wood and there are now so many things made out of paper. Therefore, we have an immense asset which we are throwing away, I am afraid, because of the continuance of the unwise policy which now prevails. I know that this is a big question which we should not pass over in such a light way and I would therefore propose that we allow the matter to stand and discuss it more fully at a future time.

Mr. FIELDING. This does not affect the question of an export duty.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to supplement what has been said by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) by saying that there is a considerable number of pulp and paper mills at the present time in the United States that draw their total supply of pulp wood from the different provinces of Canada. If they were not able to get their pulp wood from Canada it would be necessary to remove their pulp and paper mills to this country in order to carry on their business. I have in my mind some mills in the state of Maine that get their total supply now from the province of New Brunswick and they have no other source of supply except the forests of that province or the forests of Quebec. A great deal of that land is owned by private parties. Should the local government wish to place restrictions upon the export of this pulp wood they could not affect property owned by private individuals. They would still have the right to sell their pulp wood. But if, on the contrary, the Dominion government were to impose an export duty it would make it imperative on the part of these mill-owners to locate their mills in Canada and we would get the benefit of the manufacture of this raw material into the finished product. The same thing would apply that has applied in other industries and has brought to Canada those great manufacturing works that have been located in Hamilton, St. Johns, Quebec, and other parts of Canada. I think this is a matter that the government should take up at the earliest possible moment and should look into very carefully. You cannot impose any duty without affecting some individual rights, and it is just a question of the greatest good to the greatest number. It should be the duty of the government to ascertain which is the greatest number and what is the greatest good, and I am sure that if they approach the subject in that way with a desire to do that which is going to be the best for the general welfare of the whole of this country, they will say that however much it may interfere with some individuals for a year or two—and it would only be for a year or two at the very utmost, and I do not believe it would even operate for that length of time because the Americans who run their mills on the other side would find it absolutely necessary to pay