

to anybody, because the same resolution that gives power to impose \$2 gives special power to the Government to take the duty away, should they see fit. Should trade negotiations result in giving us free access to other markets this might be done. That is not unconstitutional. Parliament has given the Government power to take off duty and Parliament is asked to give them power to increase the duty to what has been already voted by Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman is laying down a doctrine which is wholly unconstitutional. The power of taxation is different from any other power sanctioned by Parliament. The hon. gentleman proposes that Parliament shall give the Government that delegated power which is only given to Parliament to raise taxes.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it the intention of the Government to impose an extra duty on masts, spars and piles?

Mr. McLELAN. The wording is the same as in the old Act, and I do not know that there have been any complaints of hardship.

Mr. CHARLTON. Under the same wording, spars have gone out free of duty in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, while a duty has been charged in Ontario. There has been confusion in the interpretation and application of the law, and it is to remedy that difficulty that I ask that we should define what the law is. Now masts, spars or piles are not sawlogs, and this duty is to prevent the exportation of sawlogs for the use of American mills. Masts are not exported to be used in mills but on vessels; so with spars, while piles are exported for the purpose of constructing docks and wharves. I hold that we should define what lumber is and not leave the law open to the varying construction of inspectors, as has hitherto been the case.

Mr. SPROULE. They even take pine trees the full length, and when they arrive at their destination, they are cut into lumber.

Mr. BLAKE. I move to strike out so much of the amendment as gives power to the Governor in Council to increase the duty.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will ask the Finance Minister what is the reason for increasing the duty on shingle bolts. This is a class of wood that is made up by the poorer settlers from refuse pine, and in my own section the duty is a very great hardship. I think the imposition of the duty is an error, and I cannot see why it should be increased, as the exportation was only 756 cords.

Mr. McLELAN. Many of the shingle mills near the border have been deserted, and the wood for them taken over in boats to the United States and manufactured there.

Mr. SPROULE. Along the Manitoulin Island, they take away both cedar and pine for shingles in boat loads to the other side.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a case of peculiar hardship to a poor settler, who wants to buy a barrel of flour, that he should not take these refuse pieces of pine log and convert them into shingle wood and get the highest price he can. It seems to me that this is getting protection pretty near the mud sill.

Mr. SPROULE. Some parties have contemplated building shingle mills, and after commencing operations they have stopped, because the shingle bolts were taken to the American side, and they were inclined to believe that they could not get supplies for any length of time.

Resolutions concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

CUSTOMS ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 148) further to amend the Acts relating to Duties of Customs and the importation or exportation of goods into or from Canada.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUBSTITUTES FOR BUTTER.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 149) to prohibit the manufacture and sale of substitutes for butter.

Bill read the first time.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know what is in the Bill, but I hope it does not prohibit the importation of all substitutes for butter. The title is rather wide. There are a good many very wholesome substitutes for butter.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wonder if it would cover molasses. Because in my part of the country the people use a good deal of it as a substitute for butter.

Title changed by adding after "sale of" the word "certain."

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 132) respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery be concurred in. He said: The amendment is not a substantial one. Section 12 of the Bill provides that every year each Department and each House of Parliament shall make a statement of the printing and stationery it requires. The 13th section provides that the Minister shall report to the Council the quantities required with the estimates of cost; and the Senate has added a provision, to preserve its privileges, that a report shall be made of the quantities as ordered by each House of Parliament.

Mr. TROW. I move that the following words be inserted in place of the words inserted by the Senate:—

In regard to the Stationery Departments of both Houses of Parliament, this Act shall not apply; such Departments shall be controlled by the members of each House respectively.

This amendment is merely to leave the purchase of paper as it was formerly in the hands of the members of Parliament. The selections are made in the old country; they are not made here. Firms here are not required to manufacture the articles required.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are, and the contract is given to them. I have only to say that this amendment would knock the Bill to pieces. The position which my hon. friend embodies in the amendment has been fought against in England, and the Joint Committee of the House of Lords and the House of Commons, in 1885, were strong in their recommendation that all the stationery should be controlled by the controller of stationery, and that his orders should be followed in regard to the quantity, quality and variety of the stationery required. I have not put that provision into this Bill, leaving both Houses to control their own stationery.

Mr. MITCHELL. While on this subject, I wish to say that I think the quality of the stationery we have been getting during the last few years has been extremely bad, and I have no doubt that, under the improved system, we shall get a better quality for the same money.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it has been so, it is our own fault. If every year a sub-committee of members, knowing what stationery is, were appointed to make a selection of stationery as to quality and variety, I believe it could be obtained both cheaper and better than it is at present.