

while \$6 a thousand is being paid in one county, in the adjoining county \$3.50 is being paid. I say that the most valuable product of the country is going out of it, that is, the timber in an unmanufactured state, and that is a loss which we can prevent ourselves. I ask the Government to consider this matter. I have no hope that they will do so this Session, but I do hope that, before we next meet here, the Government will have so investigated the matter for themselves and will have taken the trouble to enquire into the best interests of our people as to the protection of our forests, which are the best part of all our capital and which are so rapidly disappearing from the face of the country. After having had the experience of the export duty for the past year, they will feel encouraged to give protection to that product which cannot be replaced when once it has disappeared.

Mr. ROOME. As I was one of those who waited upon the Premier, I desire to say a word or two in relation to this matter. I differ from my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Hesson). It seems that the members who live at a distance from the elm timber are those who are agitating this matter, but the hon. members for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and Lambton (Mr. Lister), who are most interested in this matter, have not said a word in connection with it. I agreed at first with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) and other members, that the export duty should be put on, but I was wrongly informed in relation to that matter. Those gentlemen who came here from Wallaceburg and Dresden represented that they had \$1,000,000 invested, that they were employing 1,300 or 1,400 men, and were making an output of a million a year. I was informed by them that the duty on the American side on manufactured lumber had been increased to 25 or 30 per cent. On enquiry, I have found that that is not true. It was 10 per cent. before, and it is 10 per cent. now. Again, I find that they advocated the putting of a duty on staves. They are manufacturing that as well as lumber, and they wanted a duty on the export of staves and bolts, as well as upon our lumber which is sent out of the country. These gentlemen say that, because there are so many men employed in preparing lumber for export, there should be no export duty put upon this article. I approve of the action of the Minister in removing this duty, and especially at the present time, when there are many of our farmers who have contracted largely to supply timber to the American market. During the winter months, they got their timber out at a large expense. They had two or three, or perhaps five million feet of this elm timber ready for shipment when this export duty was put on. Many of them had their arrangements made for hauling this timber to the other side, and then the duty of a dollar a thousand feet was put on. Many of these young men who had devoted their winter to this work would be ruined by this export duty. In justice to the farming class of the community, I do not think it was right to impose that duty in that way. If the Government had put on an export duty which was to come in force next year or next winter, it would not have been so bad. I have not seen one farmer come here during this Session to advocate a duty on elm logs, and the farmers are the men who are most interested. Everyone who is interested in elm timber knows that, when the land is drained, the elm timber dies. In the western part of Ontario now there is a large amount of drainage going on, and, when the water is removed, the elm timber dies. The Minister has stated that during recess he was going to consider the matter, and endeavor to find a remedy for the state of affairs that exist, and I think a better plan could not be adopted. I have the honor to represent a county in which there are a number of mills manufacturing staves and bolts. These mills have been supplied with logs during the present year, and I think no harm can come from the proposition of the Minister being adopted. During the time between the present and the next Session of Parliament,

the Government can consult the farmers and the owners of timber and see what it is best to do. I am a believer in the National Policy, but I do not believe in an export duty which will do more harm than benefit to those who are most deeply interested.

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa). I have been very much interested in the debate on this question. I was asked to join a deputation to wait on the hon. Premier upon the subject, and I have taken an interest in supporting the measure which the representative men in that industry have brought before this House. I have gone into a calculation in reference to the production of this lumber, and the sawing of these logs in the section of country where they grow, and I find that there is a sacrifice on the benefits that should arise from the manufacture thereof in this country of at least \$4.25 a thousand, under the system of free entry to the United States. I make that up in this way: I consider that the sawing of these logs in this country is worth \$3 a thousand—that the labor costs that much, merely to saw these logs ready for market; I reckon the slabs and refuse to be worth, at least, 25 cents a thousand for fuel or other purposes, and I contend that \$1 will not over represent the profit that may fairly be taken into account in sawing these logs. That calculation on the amount of lumber, which my hon. friend has given to this House as being produced annually in one particular section, in this particular branch of lumber, 52,000,000 feet, makes a total loss to the labor and general interests of this country of \$212,500. Now, I contend that the policy of protection should cover the manufacture of the products of trees in all sections of the country, as much as it covers any other trade that we have to foster and encourage; and if we allow logs to be exported free, we rob the farmers and owners of timber of their right to make a profit on those trees. My hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Patterson) has given to this House an illustration which, it seems to me, is foreign to the argument; he appears to have given the results of the manufacture of these logs in his section of the country in the interests of the exporters. If these logs are worth \$6 a thousand for pine, as has been shown, and we get \$3.50 a thousand on exporting them to the United States, there is a clear difference in favor of their manufacture in the locality referred to of \$2.50, besides all the advantages which I have stated would accrue on the sawing in this country. Hard wood timber, as is well known, grows in many localities that have not hitherto been accessible. We see this on the line of the Canada Atlantic Railway, which runs through a section of country where hard woods prevail and where much of the pine had been taken off. On the line of that railway, in the short distance between here and Alexandria, there have been 12 or 15 mills constructed for the purpose of converting the hard wood trees into money for the use of the settlers. Last year Parliament was opposed to the imposition of an export duty. I cannot, for the life of me, understand on what ground that opposition was based. I contend that those who have been cutting their trees and disposing of them at from \$2.50 to \$3 per thousand had no saving of money for the trees; they merely got paid for the labor expended in getting them to market, but they sacrificed the profit that should be gained by cutting up the trees in the neighborhood where they grow. I do not know the section of country with which the hon. member for Hamilton and the hon. member who is before me (Mr. Hesson) are familiar, and whether they possess reasonable means of transportation by rail for the products of those logs. I have no doubt, however, with the enormous increase in railway facilities, that the country will be supplied in all its principal localities with means for the transportation of whatever products that section of the country may have to dispose of. On that account, no doubt, that section of country where these elm trees grow will, in a very short time, if not already, be supplied with the means of transportation which will enable them