

ment is allowed to do the dishonorable act Canada will be placed in a bad position."

At this juncture Ald. Scott stated that the speaker was going away from the resolution, to which Mr. Edwards replied that if he were not allowed to talk he would withdraw. This he did, with the understanding that at a later period the export duty would be discussed.

The chairman took exception to the word "dishonorable," as used by Mr. Edwards, when the latter most willingly withdrew it.

Then followed Dr. Spohn in support of the resolution. "In discussing this question," he said, "we must take into consideration the interests of the people. All will admit that the greatest benefit is derived from the manufacturing of the lumber and from permanent citizens. The men who take out the logs are a floating population, here to-day and gone to-morrow. The raw material is the property of the people, and we should obtain every possible benefit from it, instead of having the trees taken to Michigan to be manufactured and the stumps left in Canada. I claim that the Ontario government should make such restrictions as would compel the manufacture of our timber to be done in this country. Mr. Edwards appealed too much to sentiment. The United States people bought the limits with their eyes open, and the Ontario government is free to make any change they may see fit in the interests of the country. Mr. Peters, of Parry Sound, sent twenty million feet of lumber to the United States last year, and if the Ontario government complied with the resolution Mr. Peters says he is prepared to cut the lumber in Canada. The American lumbermen owning mills in Canada are not in favor of the Dingley policy. Such legislation is calculated to ruin towns and villages. Ontario wants to anchor her people down in thriving villages, and the proposal of Ald. Scott is calculated to do so."

COMPARISON OF FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. Edwards asked Dr. Spohn how much lumber was cut annually in Ontario outside of the Ottawa valley.

The exact amount Dr. Spohn could not say, but he compared the poor lumberman of the Georgian Bay with his more fortunate friend in the Ottawa valley. "We are handicapped by freight rates to the extent of from one to two dollars," said the doctor, "and we have to pay higher prices for our timber limits owing to the competition from the Americans."

Mr. Edwards: "As to freight rates to Quebec we are in a better position, but it costs twice as much to take out timber in the Ottawa valley as in the Georgian Bay district."

(Voices): "No, not that much."

Mr. Scott: "As Mr. Edwards referred to the question of freight rates, I would like to ask him what the freight is from Ottawa to New York by way of Albany."

Mr. Edwards: "The freight from the Ottawa valley to New York, via the Canada Atlantic Railway, is, I think, three dollars. We can ship by boat in summer time for \$2.50, and if by all rail one dollar extra."

Ald. Scott: "The lowest freight rate from the Georgian Bay to New York by way of Albany is four dollars, and by Buffalo and Tonawanda five dollars. That is the advantage the eastern

manufacturers have over those on the Georgian Bay."

Mr. John Waldie then rose to his feet. He pronounced himself as being strongly in favor of the resolution, which, he said, was not an exceptional one. The timber was a product which could not be reproduced. With regard to the Ontario government taking such an action as was proposed, it was nothing more than had been adopted in British Columbia and by the Dominion government with respect to the Northwest, where the purchasers of property were compelled to establish a mill. "Our friends from the Ottawa valley," said Mr. Waldie, "are exceptionally located. As Canadians surely we are not going to allow the Americans to take away the timber from the Georgian Bay without saying a word. The new tariff was simply a bonus to Americans. Are we going to submit that the Washington government shall grant a bonus of two dollars per thousand feet to take all the timber from the Georgian Bay to Michigan. If that is the situation, then I will be compelled to close my mill and send my logs to Michigan. Neces-



MR. E. W. RATHBUN.

sity will compel me to do so to meet my liabilities. Why, in five years' time I believe the United States people would sweep the whole north shore. We are therefore threatened with extinction by the Dingley bill, and the provincial government have a right to legislate in our behalf. We are prepared to stand the consequences. It will result in a curtailment of production, which will ultimately be beneficial; we are getting rid of our timber too quickly. The Americans come in here, buy up limits, and set to work to clear them off in about two years. They have no further interests here, and I claim it is not such men British law was designed to protect. The men supporting the resolution before the meeting are men whose interests are in Canada, men who are paying taxes, whose families live here, and it is the duty of the government to give them British justice. The resolution submitted is preferable to an export duty, which might injure the pulp industry and in certain districts deprive some of their means of support. A comparison has been made by one of the speakers to the cotton industry. Such a comparison is, I think, unfair, because the timber is the growth of a lifetime." Mr. Waldie concluded with the

remark that he was in favor of Ontario manufacturing Ontario timber, and was heartily applauded.

MR. CHARLTON URGES DELAY.

An opponent of the resolution was next heard, in the person of Mr. John Charlton, M. P., who said he thought the Dingley bill a most outrageous measure. "If only my feelings were concerned," continued Mr. Charlton, "I would only be too glad to give a Roland for an Oliver. But we must consult our interests. The question is a business question to be dealt with upon broad principles, so as not to result injurious to ourselves. The provisions in the Dingley Bill with regard to lumber naturally awakens sentiment in Canada; it is an action for which we are not responsible. I am told that I am the champion of American interests. I wish to say that I am not; I have no saw mill in the United States; nine-tenths of my holdings of timber limits are in the Ottawa Valley. My interests are therefore identical with those of the other gentlemen present. The difference is simply a divergence of opinion. The proposal before the meeting is intended as a flank movement to arrive at the results of an export duty without incurring the penalty. I say, gentlemen, that the two propositions aim at the same result, and will be construed as such by the United States government. The Ontario government have no right to impose such a restriction upon the timber lands except at the time of sale. Those men who bought lands on the understanding that they should tow logs from Canada at their pleasure have rights which the country is bound to observe. There is doubt, too, as to what the United States might do in the case of an export duty being imposed by Canada. I think the export duty preferable to the resolution before the meeting. If Canada prohibited the exportation of logs, the United States might prohibit the importation of lumber."

"Let them do it!" was heard from all round the room.

"Then," Mr. Charlton continued, "the towing of logs has not been found satisfactory. The firm of Holland, Graves & Montgomery found that the loss in towing was about 20 per cent. Mr. Peters has removed to Canada; a mill is being removed to Byng Inlet, and another one to St. Johns Island, all on account of the cost of towing logs across the lake. Then, at the Ontario government sale in 1892, over a quarter of a million dollars was realized for 600 square miles of timber limits—a most extraordinary price—and the Americans purchasing them expected to be allowed to enjoy the property they secured. Before taking any action it would well to enquire what the result would be. It is a question if the American government cannot impose the additional duty the moment such action as recommended is taken by the Ontario government. There is a moral certainty that our position will be as bad as if we imposed an export duty. I would prefer the latter, then we would know what the action of the Congress would be."

"What have we to do with what Congress does?" was asked.

"Will it not affect our interests," asked Mr. Charlton, "if Congress says that in view of Canada's action lumber cannot be imported to