

That I think would be a very fair arrangement. It would enable people there to dress rough lumber from the United States and be a great advantage to the mills we have on our side, without, I think, doing any harm.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad the Government have decided not to increase the duty upon spruce logs, but I regret they have not seen their way clear to abolish it altogether. As I pointed out the other evening, this duty bears entirely upon the Province from which I come. The whole of the duty paid last year came from the Province of Quebec, and anybody who is familiar with the border between Quebec and the New England States must be aware that a great many logs have been exported thence without paying duty. People who have bought logs in our country have taken them over into the United States and have not paid the duty, but in consequence of their being obliged to pay a duty, were they found out, they have paid our people to cut these logs on their farms, in the neighborhood of the border, the lower prices which was necessitated by the fact that they have to pay the duty. The consequence is that while our farmers clearing up land in that portion of the country, have obtained the less price which the duty necessitates, the Government of the country have not obtained that duty. We know that the sum of \$49,000 obtained from spruce logs which according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, came from exports last year from the Province of Quebec, is absurdly below the mark, as was pointed by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) the other evening. It is evident that there must be some great blunder either in the returns or in the printing of the blue book, and I have no reason to believe it was in the printing, because I know that the logs are not very carefully examined or tested, and I believe that a large number indeed are carried across the border without paying duty. This is a matter which bears entirely upon the people who cut the logs. The men who are clearing up the land and trying to make farms in that new country get just so much less for the logs they have to sell and they are taxed for the benefit, so far as I can see, of nobody at all. The Government of this country does not obtain the revenue; the lumbermen here are not benefited, because it is necessary, from the relative position of the land and the mills, that they shall go across the border and not be sawed up on our side of the line. I think, therefore, this tax is a burdensome one, bearing especially upon a comparatively poor section of the community, and which ought to be abolished.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the House to support his amendment. It is extremely objectionable to propose that the Executive should be entrusted with the power of increasing the duties. It is so far as I know unprecedented and it is certainly very objectionable. It is not, as the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said, a reservation of power, it is a proposal to grant this power to the Executive. Then, there is no special reason for it in this case. We are not very far removed from the end of one Session to the beginning of another. If circumstances at any particular time require an increase of this duty or the creation of any other duty it is not very long to wait till Parliament will meet and the representatives of the people be called together to decide whether a duty should be curtailed or increased. I trust, therefore, the hon. gentleman after making certain improvements in the proposition submitted to the House will not accompany those improvements with a proposition which is objectionable from a constitutional point of view and from every other point of view, for I agree with the hon. gentleman, that so far from this being advantageous in a political point of view, it is more likely to be disadvantageous than otherwise.

Mr. HESSON. I hope the Government will not reduce the duty to the old standard of \$1. Our forests are now

being denuded and destroyed, and our logs are being carried away. I read letters the other evening that went to prove that this was the case and that lumberers are building large barges to take lumber over to Bay City and Saginaw.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is all bosh.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has no right to say so. The evidence came from responsible gentlemen residing in the country. They are much interested in preventing this state of things continuing, and they have taken the trouble of making it known to me. I know it is not all bosh. It is a very serious matter, and the Government should not permit it to continue. We are entitled to put as much export duty on sawlogs as the Americans put on our lumber. We are doing a gross injustice to those gentlemen who have erected mills here to permit people to come here and buy timber limits and cut the logs and float them down Georgian Bay or Lake Huron and take them to the American market. They only pay \$1 per thousand on logs measured in the water, when they are very indifferently measured, and if we export 1,000 feet of boards they charge us \$2. It is a gross injustice. I hope the Government will not alter their policy. I should be very sorry if a gentleman, and especially one interested in the lumber trade in the Western States, in Michigan, by favoring the exportation of sawlogs in a rough state and thus destroying our milling interest and damaging the lumbering interests of the country as well, should succeed in its proposition.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to offer a personal explanation as I have been personally alluded to. I may be permitted to say in the first place that I used an expression that is not strictly parliamentary, and I retract it. The hon. gentleman alluded to me as a party engaged in lumbering in Michigan and consequently interested in having an export duty on logs. I am happy to inform my hon. friend that my interests in Michigan have ceased, that I am closing out my business there, and that I have acquired limits in Canada, and that it was from the standpoint of a Canadian lumberman engaged in Canada that I specially advocated freedom from duty. That being my position I felt very apprehensive of the effect on the Canadian lumber trade of the proposition made by the Government when these resolutions were submitted. I think the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) is also under misapprehension with regard to the duty. The Finance Minister does not propose to reduce the duty to \$1, but to \$2, but on spruce only, which is a very inferior class of timber, it is proposed that the duty should be put back at \$1 per thousand.

Resolution, as amended, concurred in.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to move that "logs" be struck out and "sawlogs" inserted instead. Unless this be done, sawlogs, masts and piling will be liable to the export duty under this law, and those have been classed under the denomination of logs for a number of years past.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister of Finance will surely give us some explanation before he asks us to follow an unconstitutional course in regard to giving the Government the power to impose duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I disagree with the hon. gentleman that there is anything unconstitutional in the House giving certain powers by way of delegation to the Executive. It is to be remembered that the committee of the whole House has already agreed to impose a duty of \$1 per thousand. On consideration, the Government have decided to recommend the House to reduce that to \$1, but they ask the House to give them power to increase it to \$3 should they think it in the public interest to do so. It may be very much in the public interest to have that power before Parliament meets again. It cannot be in any sense by way of menace