

tified the Government in omitting the manufacturing clause in connection with the timber sale held in 1892.

The Result Proved the Wisdom

of this determination. Out of the 633 miles sold, only 78 miles were purchased by Americans, from which no logs were exported. The entire quantity of logs shipped across the line from the Territory did not exceed 5,000,000 feet, yet, if the Opposition leader's suggestion had then been followed, the Government, to save this trifling loss, would have plunged the whole lumber trade into confusion, endangered the satisfactory understanding arrived at with the Washington Government, and effectually blocked the way to any further concessions.

During the session of 1893, a motion was introduced by Mr. Miscoampbell, M.P.P., for East Simcoe, as follows:

"That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following substituted: 'This House disapproves of the policy of disposing of the timber reserves of the Province without its approval being first obtained, and is of the opinion that the right to cut timber upon the present reserves should be sold under such conditions as will ensure the manufacture of lumber cut therefrom within the Province, and more effectually guard against the unnecessary cutting and destruction of small timber growing in such reserves.'"

The Fallacy of the Resolution.

This resolution, being moved on going into Committee of Supply, could not be amended. It embodied two distinct propositions which had nothing to do with each other. The Government could not in any case accept the first of these, requiring a previous vote of the Legislature before timber could be sold. Forest fires often rendered it necessary to dispose promptly of damaged timber to prevent great loss, which might result while waiting months or a year for a sitting of the House. The wording of the clause relating to the manufacture of lumber was objectionable even if the Government had been disposed at that time to accept the general principle. By

confining the manufacture of lumber to the "Province"—"within the Province," it would have prevented Quebec mill owners buying and operating limits in Ontario. The motion in such a form did not commend itself to the House, and was defeated by a majority of 21.

During the campaign of 1894 the policy of the Government was clearly defined in a pamphlet reviewing the situation as follows:

"The policy of the Government as to the question of imposing manufacturing conditions has been and is, that while the question of admitting Canadian lumber to the American market free of duty, is before the Congress of the United States, it would be advisable, and possibly disastrous, to impose manufacturing conditions upon them..... It will be time enough to consider what the policy should be in the future, after we have seen what action the American Congress takes on this very vital and important matter. The Government are open to deal with the question in the manner best suited to the public wants."

The People Approved.

The question was thoroughly discussed before the electors, and the popular verdict sustained the administration. Shortly afterwards the passage of the Wilson Bill through the United States Congress removed the remaining import duty on lumber, and the Canadian Manufacturer secured free access to the American market. Free lumber removed the incentive to the exportation of saw logs. The lumber trade of Ontario received a great stimulus. Both the coarse and fine grades of lumber, were exported, production was cheapened, waste lessened and the industry enjoyed a high degree of prosperity.

But with the advent of the Republican party to power, in 1897, came a complete change. The Dingley Bill, embodying a highly protectionist tariff, was enacted. The import duty on sawn lumber was placed at \$2.00 per 1000 feet, and a clause was added providing that in case an export duty on logs was imposed by Canada, or any other country, an equal amount would be