

that, thanks to the fact that we have been preventing the export of logs from the province of Ontario, we have been able to manufacture a much larger quantity of lumber in that country, and that as a result the total aggregate exports of lumber show an increase of \$24,000,000. I am here to tell the government that they are not dealing fairly with the lumber exporter of Ontario and that they are not dealing fairly with the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia, that while we allow the people of the United States to bring their lumber into Canada free of duty, we at the same time permit them to levy \$2 per thousand on our lumber exported into the United States, and having the honour to represent a constituency which is largely concerned with the question of lumber, I am prepared to second the efforts of every hon. gentleman from British Columbia who, from time to time, has importuned and begged of this government that they will place a fair duty on lumber at least equal to the duty levied by the American government against our lumber. There is a duty devolving upon some of those hon. gentlemen who represent Ontario constituencies and that is not only to go behind the backs of their electors and of hon. gentlemen in this House and importune and beg the government to make changes in the tariff, but, when the question presents itself to them in this way, that they should become the educators of public opinion when we are endeavouring to point out to their fellow members and to the members of the government where changes should be made in the tariff and why these changes should be made, and I hope that before the session closes, by a number of specific motions, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will have an opportunity of voting for raises in the tariff where necessary, or voting in favour of lowering the tariff on certain lines. If these hon. gentlemen see fit to shirk the votes on these occasions they will have to be watched and watched very closely by their constituents.

This session has been very aptly called the Grand Trunk session, and I am here as a humble representative of the people to say that I believe the opposition were justified last session in protesting against this vast expenditure of public money on this so-called transcontinental railway, and that it is the duty of the opposition to endeavour to educate public opinion throughout the Dominion by a discussion in this House of this great question particularly in view of the fact that circumstances have changed and changed very materially since last session in regard to the question of transportation. What does this government propose to do? This government proposes to perpetrate an act of idiotic folly. I think that was the term used by the former member for St. John, Mr. Blair, last session. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told the people of Canada

that they are going to transport the grain from Winnipeg to Moncton, 1,800 miles, and that in this they will be able to compete with the present carrying routes. That is the proposition. It has been stated here this afternoon and I know it to be the fact that last season the vessels were carrying grain from the head of Lake Superior to Quebec at the rate of three cents a bushel. Nay, more, grain was carried for as low as two and a half cents a bushel. Let any man look at the transportation business between Canada and Great Britain to-day. No man can go to Montreal or Quebec and see a ship loaded wholly with grain. Why? Because it would not possibly pay a tramp steamer to carry grain alone. All the grain that is exported from Canada to the old country is exported in vessels which have, in addition to their grain cargoes, large quantities of other cargo, and not only have they other freights but several of them have mail subsidies and passenger lists. Last year an American company essayed to carry grain from the head of Lake Superior to Quebec. They placed on that route vessels carrying 60,000 bushels of grain and no man can dispute the fact that that grain was carried from the head of Lake Superior to Quebec for three cents a bushel. The distance from Depot Harbour or Midland to Montreal is 360 miles, and the railway companies have been securing 3 cents a bushel as their share, and have been paying the vessels which carry the wheat from Port Arthur to the Georgian Bay ports, 1½ cents a bushel, so that the charge is 4½ cents a bushel from Port Arthur to Montreal, and in competition with them we have certain vessels carrying wheat at 3 cents a bushel from the head of the lakes through to Quebec. Surely the government cannot argue before the people of Canada, and in view of these facts, that the transcontinental railway is going to be a paying proposition. But no matter what happens, the government seem determined to sink an enormous amount of money in this foolish enterprise, contrary to the wishes of the people of Canada and contrary to the wishes of the Grand Trunk itself. At a recent meeting of the Grand Trunk directors in London, it was openly declared that the Grand Trunk Railway Company never wanted this railway which the government seeks to force upon them. It was declared that their original proposition was to build a line from North Bay, and that the building of the line from Winnipeg to Moncton is an act of supreme folly. That is what Sir Rivers Wilson, the president of the Grand Trunk Company, said, and in the face of all that, this government seems determined to rush on this scheme. Let us not forget the stand which Mr. Blair took last session. We know that the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was put up to reply to Mr. Blair, and his reply was that Mr. Blair was opposed to this scheme solely because there would not