export it. I would further say that if they do not cut the pulpwood and export it, it invariably gets burned and the country derives no benefit from it whatever, and the settler is held back. It appears to me, therefore, that it would be very injudicious for the Government to interfere with the exportation of pulpwood. They certainly will get into trouble.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: I agree with what the honourable gentleman says, but I do not think there is any intention—at all events, not immediately—to exercise that power; but it is understood that the Government will take that power and it may be used as an offset in bargaining for certain things with the adjoining Republic. It seems to me that if I had pulpwood on my farm and wanted to sell it no Government would have the right to interfere.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It is only the export.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: It is a peculiar thing for the Government to take to itself powers which it never expects to exercise.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The Governor in Council may by regulation prohibit the exportation of pulpwood. I have this statement of the Minister of Finance:

It is to give the government power to make regulations having in view the prohibition of export of pulpwood. It might be a general prohibitory regulation with out any qualification, or a regulation prohibiting export under certain conditions. For example, it has been suggested that it would be wise and expedient to exempt farmers who have pulpwood to clear off their land. We have not any plan in detail. If a plan is evolved we might put it in operation in a general way or subject to qualification; this would be a matter for further inquiry. The wording of the resolution implies that it may be desirable to distinguish between quality and character of wood.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: At the present time the Provinces do not allow it to be exported in the raw state from licensed lands; the settlers, of course, have that right. Do you say the Government is taking authority to prevent that?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The Minister of Finance says:

It is argued that the forests are becoming destroyed, that we need to put on some general restrictions, and particularly that this is a very valuable article that we need at home. There is much to be said on both sides of the question, but generally speaking the argument is that we should use it at home instead of exporting it. I am giving the current view on the subject; just how far we may act on this resolution is a question that remains to be considered.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: There has been too much exportation of pulpwood from this country, and, owing to that exportation in large

S-773

quantities, and owing to the fires that unfortunately have taken place in the forests of this country, they are being rapidly denuded and the matter of forest protection is becoming a serious question. If it is necessary that the rights of individuals should be invaded in the public interest, it should be done, because we are very largely dependent upon waterpowers in this country, and will be more dependent upon them when our population increases in time to come; and the protection of our forests means the protection of our water-powers. If you destroy the forests you have no reservoirs for the water. The water flows to the sea, destroying the denuded lands as it flows. Parts of China and Spain have been almost destroyed for the same reason; and the same was true of India until a system of reforestation was undertaken by the British Government. In my own Province and in the Province of Nova Scotia the land, if left to itself, will become reforested. It is not necessary to do any planting, as perhaps it would be in the Province of Ontario and in the West. I am strongly in favour of any legislation which will tend to protect the forests of this country, and I hope the Government will exercise their power, or, if necessary, will take power to bring about that protection.

Hon. F. B. BLACK: There is just one objection that I have to this measure, and that is that it does not go far enough. The prohibition of the export of pulpwood in Canada is no new thing. Quebec, New Brunswick, Ontario, and British Columbia have prohibited the exportation of pulpwood from Crown lands.

In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick we have a very good illustration of the effect of such legislation. In the Province of New Brunswick we have been able to establish very important industries, which are growing and being added to year by year, by retaining the pulpwood in our own Province. The reverse side of the shield is seen when you look at our neighboring Province of Nova Scotia, the Government of which has not taken similar action in that respect. In that Province they have not had the same industrial development that we have had along that line. Their lands are now almost entirely in the hands of owners in the United States, who are cutting pulpwood off the Crown lands and privately-owned lands and taking it into the United States for manufacture. It is true that if you put a prohibition on the export of pulpwood from privately-owned lands, you apparently create