

Mr. Charlton places the value of the exports of logs from Canada to the United States, from 1890 to 1896, at \$10,959,000, and the imports of logs during the same period at \$6,361,000, making a total excess of log exports in that period from Canada of \$3,698,000; but in point of fact, his import figures include values of logs which are only nominally imported, and deducting these it will be found that the imports of logs for Canadian consumption, taking his figures as correct, was but \$2,248,000, making the actual excess of log exports for that period about \$7,800,000.

I reduce Mr. Charlton's log imports by those to New Brunswick that are taken out in Northern Maine—floated by the St. John River to Fredericton and St. John, where they are sawed and the lumber shipped back to the United States or to Great Britain. The owners of the timber tracts in Northern Maine have had no other outlet, and I understand railways are now contemplated, or under construction, from Bangor and other centres, which will soon transfer the manufacture to points within their own borders. The United States authorities treat these logs and their products as home production.

To add the imports and exports previous to 1890 lessens the difference—for I have no doubt the records will pretty clearly show that the white pine and spruce pulp manufacturers of the Northern United States commenced to look to Canada for their raw material, only some seven or eight years ago, which but confirms the belief that they will continue to want our timber in growing quantities. They have quickly prohibited other raw products of Canada the moment they could do without them, and they would as readily do so with saw-logs and spruce were they not necessary to them. It is quite within their province to do so, and it is equally our right to stipulate, that if they shut out the sawed lumber and pulp of Canada, both raw materials to them, that they invite an export duty on logs and pulpwood equivalent to the extent of their import duty on the same products, the reasonableness of which none can deny.

The discrimination against Canadian sawed lumber and pulp by the contemplated import duties under the Dingley Bill, appears unwarranted and unfair from every standpoint.

Canadian lumbermen pretty well know the value of their forests, for the highest prices paid at the sale of timber limits referred to by Mr. Charlton were by Canadian operators, to whom is due every honorable effort to remove the discrimination under the Dingley Bill which threatens their investments by forcing them to manufacture in the States or cut their limits less closely than, without the threatened discrimination, would be done. Ontario gained in revenue from the timber sale referred to, but lost indirectly in the diminution of industrial establishments, which would have been of more permanent benefit. These desirable results a stable forest policy of the character outlined would quickly bring about.

I am quite convinced the proposed \$2.00 duty on Canadian lumber without a corresponding export duty on logs means the closing of the