

eloquent perorations on the fact that he was born in Glengarry, and that he was sent to defend the interests of the people of Ontario. He (Mr. McLaughlin) ventured to say that the member for Glengarry was the only member of the Opposition who had been sent pledged to stand up for the rights of Ontario. He imagined the people of Glengarry addressing their member as a native of Glengarry to the manor born, but reminding him that he was a long time out of Ontario, and under the influence of the Mosseaus, the Chapleaus, the Carons, and the Langevins, of Quebec, who had not the kindest feelings towards the Province of Ontario. They recollected when Upper Canada paid the taxes and Lower Canada spent them. His constituents must have told him that when he went to the Legislature, he should leave Quebec behind him and stand up for the interests of Ontario. (Applause.) They had seen clearly how that gentleman had stood up for the interests of Ontario. Referring then to the Streams Bill, he said that however much gentlemen opposite might desire to impress upon the people of the country that it was a question only to be argued by constitutional lawyers, they would find that every man would argue that question. (Hear, hear.) The men of the Province would discuss the question and they would take a common sense view of it. He read the principle laid down by Sir John Macdonald himself, the leader of the hon. gentlemen opposite, which was that where a measure is considered only partially defective, or where it is objectionable as being prejudicial to the general interests of the Dominion, or as clashing with its legislation, communication should be had with the Provincial Government with respect to such measure, and that in such case the Act should not be disallowed, if the general interests permitted such a course, until the Local Government has an opportunity of considering and discussing the objections taken, and the Local Legislature has also an opportunity of remedying the defects found to exist. Here the principle was laid down that before a Bill was disallowed by the general Government the Legislature should be informed of the fact that there was something defective, and see if they could not remedy it. Every person on his trial had a right to be heard. Even the vilest assassin was not condemned unheard, and yet this Bill was condemned unheard. The House would remember that the member for East Toronto laboured very hard the other evening to demonstrate that the British North America Act gave the Dominion Government power to disallow any Act of a Local Legislature. Hon. gentlemen opposite had quoted from Mr. Blake on this question, and he too would read them the same authority. Mr. Blake said: "There was no matter more important than the maintenance of the principle that our own Local Legislature acting within the scope of its own powers dealing with those affairs which the Constitution has entrusted to the Provinces, cannot be inter-meddled with by the disallowance of Bills by the Ontario Government, whether they did so justly or unjustly he believed was a matter of indifference, it was the decision of the people through their representatives in the Legislature. The Federal Government had no right within the spirit, or as he believed within the letter, of the Act to disallow an Act because the Federal authorities deemed it unwise or unjust." (Applause) Since the speeches of the Commissioner of Crown Lands and the member for Huron, he believed the Opposition had received new light on these two matters, and he hoped they would yet retrace their steps while there was an opportunity, and assist in the defence of Ontario's territory and rights. (Loud applause.)

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings) complimented the Commissioner of Crown Lands upon the able speech he delivered the day previous. He declared his readiness, however, to stand or fall by the position taken by the member for London (Mr. Meredith). Mr. Robertson proceeded to deplore the course of the Government in dismissing certain officials in the county of Hastings, and signified his intention of asking for information regarding these dismissals. With respect to the intention of establishing a Bureau of Statistics he thought it would involve an expenditure for which there would be little return, and it would only afford a place for office-seekers. As to market fees he had discovered, he said, that their abolition would not entirely please the farmers.

Mr. MILLER began by complimenting both sides of the House on the character of the speeches made, and regretted that the Commissioner of Crown Lands in particular did not favour the House more frequently with such able and eloquent speeches as that to which they listened during yesterday's session. With respect to the contention of the hon. leader of the Opposition that the Government should not retain complete control of the sale of timber limits without reference to that House, he heartily concurred, and hoped that such a check would at all events be placed on the Executive before the hon. gentlemen to the left crossed over to the Government benches. There were 17,000 square miles of timber under license in Ontario, over 14,000 of which had been granted by the old Province of Canada, when the friends of the Opposition were in the habit of granting to their supporters timber at a nominal price of \$4 a square mile. The late Mr. Sandfield Macdonald decided that these limits should be sold by public auction, and they ran up to \$240 a square mile. Still, however, notwithstanding this great improvement, the Government at Ottawa continued to grant timber licenses on the old plan in the disputed territory. Large limits have been thus sold at a nominal price to a Mr. Macaulay, who in turn sold them to a third party for \$250,000. When the Ontario Government got possession of that territory they could not deprive the third party of his acquired rights, consequently the action of the Dominion Government in this one case alone entailed a loss of \$250,000 upon the Province. (Hear, hear.)

subject to.

Mr. MILLER did not think that the hon. gentleman so expressed himself. The settlers, he contended, were amply provided for under the Homestead and Free Grant Act. He then reverted to the quantity of timber under license in Ontario, 17,000 square miles, which computation did not include the disputed territory. Besides this there were about 3,000 square miles of fine wooded country yet to be licensed. They had no further to go unless they got the disputed territory. Experience had taught lumbermen that the 20,000 square miles of limits would contain an area of 12,800,000 feet, which would eventually cut 2,000 feet per acre over the whole, a larger estimate than usually made. That would give 25,000,000,000 feet, about the same estimate as was applied to the disputed territory. Looking at the foreign demand for timber he found that the city of Chicago last year imported 2,000,000,000 feet, or one thirteenth of all the timber in Ontario. Having regard for the increasing demand and the diminishing supply, the value of the timber in the disputed territory must be carefully considered. 250,000,000,000 feet at one dollar a thousand would yield a revenue of \$25,000,000. They would also have to bear in mind the scarcity of timber in Manitoba and the North-West in computing the value of timber sold on the Georgian Bay. The cost of transportation from Georgian Bay to the Rainy River will be six dollars a thousand, so that timber standing on the shores of the Lake of the Woods was worth six dollars a thousand more than the thousand feet in Ontario. (Applause.) In Winnipeg the price per thousand for lumber was \$30 or \$40, while it was sold in Toronto for from \$12 50 to \$15 per thousand. (Hear, hear.) In that view of the question, and taking the value of the licenses at one dollar a thousand, the timber in the disputed territory would be worth \$150,000,000—(Hear, hear)—and the Province of Ontario would have that much additional territory, and it was as likely to be an under estimate as over it. Passing on to speak of the Rivers and Streams Bill, he said that they were quite competent to deal with it. He had been brought so directly in contact with the question that it had forced itself upon his mind that he would be remiss in his duty to the House and to the country if he failed to put his views upon record. He had always thought, and he thought then, that in passing that Bill it would have been proper and right to have exempted Mr. McLaren and Mr. Caldwell from the operations of that Bill, and if that had been done they would have had no disallowance and no constitutional question would have arisen. He knew something of the difficulty in getting rivers and streams ready to drive timber. He instanced the case of a man having a lot of lumber up a stream, and he (Mr. Miller) having some further up the stream. If the first man was an enterprising, pushing man, all he (Mr. Miller) would have to do would be to wait until the first man had gone in and made all necessary improvements, and then he could throw his logs into the stream and send them down, taking advantage of all his neighbours' improvements simply by paying some small toll. There was no remuneration which would compensate a man for the trouble he had been put to.

Mr. FRASER—How is it that a company of lumbermen operating in Muskoka waters, who make improvements of this kind, pay themselves by collecting tolls in exactly the same way as Mr. McLaren would have been allowed to collect them?

Mr. MILLER—In the first place, in the Muskoka waters these gentlemen do not make the most valuable improvements.

Mr. FRASER—Does my hon. friend know that for the improvements made by the Ontario Government on the Muskoka stream the Company will have to pay, and that they propose to make further improvements where necessary, recouping themselves in the same way as provided by the Act of last session? If a company can do these things and pay themselves by imposing tolls, why cannot an individual do the same?

Mr. MILLER replied that the Muskoka required but small improvements, as \$50,000 at the outside was all that was necessary to improve it for the purpose of bringing down one thousand million feet of timber. That was clearly a stream that would never have come under the provisions of Mr. McLaren's case. Mr. McLaren had taken a stream that was in a state of nature unfit for driving logs, but the Muskoka was a large stream, and he failed to discover where they have paid anything.

Mr. FRASER—The hon. member is not meeting what I have suggested. I want to know why it is if payment by toll is right in one case, why not in another?

Mr. MILLER said he would state his case, and make it clear before he got through. It was giving the people who used the improvements an undoubted advantage over men who had made them. To take the improvements of Mr. McLaren and give them to somebody else was manifestly unfair. It was not in accordance with the principles of the Reform party that they should deal with one party differently from another. The Muskoka Company had not expended \$5,000, certainly not \$10,000, and they were allowed to collect tolls for all the timber which passed through.

Mr. FRASER—They have only the right to collect tolls having regard to the amount expended, not for improvements which they had not made at all, therefore my hon. friend is arguing on a false ground.

Mr. MILLER—While the Company have expended \$10,000, the Government has expended \$25,000, and are they not collecting for all?

Mr. FRASER—If they are doing that they are doing it illegally.

Mr. MILLER continued.