

ESTABLISHED 1866

THE MONETARY TIMES,

TRADE REVIEW AND INSURANCE CHRONICLE.

With which has been incorporated the
INTERCOLONIAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, of Montreal (in 1869), the
TRADE REVIEW, of the same city (in 1870) and the
TORONTO JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.

ISSUED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING

SUBSCRIPTION—POST-PAID:

CANADIAN SUBSCRIBERS,	\$2.00 Per Year.
BRITISH " "	10s. 6d. Sterling Per Year.
AMERICAN " "	\$2.00 United States Currency.
SINGLE COPIES	10 Cents.

Book and Job Printing a Specialty

PUBLISHED BY

THE MONETARY TIMES PRINTING CO. OF CANADA, Limited

EDW. TROUT, President

ALFRED W. LAW, Sec'y-Treas.

Office: 62 Church St., Cor. Court St.

TELEPHONES:

BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES, 1392

PRINTING DEPARTMENT, 1485

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 1899.

THE SITUATION.

A deputation of Canadian lumbermen, who waited on the Dominion Government, asked that a duty of \$2 per 1,000 feet be put on lumber, 80 cents on shingles and 25 cents on laths. The object was to check or put an end to American lumber, shingles and laths going into Manitoba, the increase of imports of forest products, chiefly there, having reached 24 per cent. since 1897. At the same time, the decrease in the export of Canadian lumber was 16 per cent., making a difference, it was assumed, in the two items, of \$5,000,000 to the Canadian lumbermen. Under the circumstances, one speaker objected to share the Canadian market with Americans; in other words, the Canadian market was asked for Canadian lumbermen. One speaker declared his opinion that every stick of timber in Canada should be cut in the country. Manitoba, it was foreseen, would object to the proposed duties; but one speaker was quite willing the province should get compensation in the form of free agricultural implements. But "the other fellow," who would be hit, would object, and a deputation from agricultural implement makers would lose no time in getting to Ottawa.

The question raised by the deputation of lumbermen distinctly makes an issue between two sections of the country, and two sets of industries; the lumberers of Ontario and the farmers of Manitoba. In listening patiently to the lumber deputation, the Government is obliged to consider both interests; Hon. Mr. Scott showed this by mildly suggesting that the Manitoba farmer might not willingly agree to carry an extra burden on shingles and laths. The Premier, at the close of the interview, pointed out that the Manitoba farmer, whom the proposed duties would affect, had a right to be heard, and would be likely to take advantage of the opportunity. This meant that before he is heard no decision will be come to. The views of the lumbermen came naturally from their position; but besides the Manitoba farmer, there is another party interested, the Canadian public, the owners of the Crown lands and pine timber. When Ontario decided to sell her forest products, in the open market to all comers, the price she got for the public property was greatly increased. If American competitors could in future sales be excluded,

the price might be expected to fall heavily. The first duty of the authorities responsible for the sale of Crown timber would seem to be to get the best price for it. This was done when the timber was sold by public competition. Are we now to prefer private to public interests?

At a meeting of the Ontario Educational Association, held in Toronto, last week, Prof. Robertson led a somewhat formidable attack on the school system of the province. He undertook to express the views of the high school and college men. He complained that there is too much uniformity, which, he says, is worshiped as a fetish, too great a tendency to unification and consolidation. He did not venture to attack University consolidation, but treated it as a moot question. He admits that this part of the system of unification is a success, but protests that it should not have been made a ground for carrying unification into other quarters. He complained of an unsuitable curriculum and unsuitable examinations, of over-pressure, of the repression of individuality, of the failure to recognize local independence as it is recognized in England, of the eternal tinkering of the education laws. Doubtless there is here some aim which is so well concealed as to be left a matter of conjecture or speculation. Prof. Robertson admits that there is jealousy between public and high school men, and that germs of jealousy between high school and university men are visible. When he had finished his paper a good deal was said by others in support of his views. One speaker thought the time for abolishing the Normal Schools had come, since free education there created too many teachers and of an inferior class. The Normal Schools were necessary in the past, and it is difficult to believe that they can now be dispensed with, but as too many teachers are being produced, it would be reasonable to reduce the production to the requirement and prevent waste.

It appears from a report of a committee of the Government of New Brunswick that the recent decision of the Privy Council on the respective rights and duties of the Dominion and the provinces, in the fisheries, are in some particulars still in the region of doubt. This is made plain by an interchange of opinions between a committee of the Government of New Brunswick and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. For the purpose of the fishery not every harbor is to be deemed a public harbor, and the question is where is the line of exclusion to be drawn. There is between the general and provincial Governments, too, a question of revenue, in connection with the fisheries. The New Brunswick committee argues that, as the provinces are limited in their sources of revenue to direct taxation and license fees, the Dominion Government should be content with merely nominal fees from the fisheries. But as the burden of protecting the fisheries is cast upon the Dominion, would this suggestion be fair? It is clear that if the outlay considerably exceeded the receipts under this head, the result would be substantially the same as an addition to the subsidies granted by the Dominion to the provinces. The right of regulating the fisheries in the public harbors is in the Dominion, and New Brunswick asks, in effect, that this right should be exercised in accordance with the wishes of the province. Here are the elements of a quarrel, whenever the disposition to make one is forthcoming. In spite of the judgment of the Privy Council, the question is still undecided whether a province possesses any proprietary rights in shore fisheries within the three-mile limit, and especially below low-water mark.

Australia is making competitive bids for immigrants in the form of free passages, and as is natural she is meet-