

knew as to the administration of this rule, but there were complaints of the principal and terms upon which they were granted. The mill-owner was compelled to pay fifteen cents per standard log on all classes of logs to the limit owner, and he was restricted in his market to the supply of the local wants. When this return came down he believed that it would be seen that the charge allowed was excessive. He believed also that the local mill owner should not be wholly restricted to the local market, but should be allowed to realise upon his cuts even if the bounds of the market to which he was restricted were extended. The cut allowed to local mill owners also was too little in many cases. There were thirteen townships in his own county in which the cut allowed to local mill owners last year was only 440,000 feet, not enough for the local demand. The local mill men were willing to pay what the limit holder was fairly entitled to say, two or three cents a standard log, but thought that even with such a reduction they should be allowed to ship to better markets part of the lumber they cut. They complained also that thousands of acres of standing timber were destroyed by fire, not being used by the lumbermen, and they—the local men—were also prohibited from using it. Of course, there was

A SORT OF ANTAGONISM

between the limit holders and the local mill owners, and the former would say that the present system was not unfair to the others, but he (Mr. Wood) could see no good reason why the lumbermen should be allowed to monopolise the timber in any part of the country.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE said he was glad to have the hon. gentleman say that there was no complaint made respecting the administration of this system—the objection being simply to the price. The lumbermen paid 75c a thousand feet on the lumber cut. The local mill owner paid \$1 50, which covered the 75c that had to be paid to the Government, and 75c for the limit owner himself. He (Mr. Pardee) thought the mover of this resolution could hardly have examined the question fully, or he would have found that the sum paid to the limit owners was as low as possible. Out of that 75 cents the limit owner had to meet the bonus, ground rent, interest on investment, etc. While the hon. gentleman was urging a reduction, the limit owners were urging an increase, which was pretty good evidence that the Government had struck the happy medium. The bonus in some cases amounted to 75 cents a thousand feet. Would it be right to say that the local mill owner should be allowed to take it for less? Prior to 1872 there was no arrangement respecting local mill men. Then an Order in Council was passed authorising the Commissioner of Crown Lands to set aside certain portions for the local mill men. This did not work satisfactorily, being found unfair in some cases to both parties. Then in 1874 an Order in Council was passed that if a local mill owner wanted lumber for local purposes he might apply to the Commissioner, when the Inspector would be called upon to declare what was necessary for the local supply, and the limit owner was directed to allow a certain quantity to be taken by the local mill owner. That system had been pursued ever since and

HAD WORKED WELL,

both parties seeming to be fairly well satisfied. Surely the mover of this resolution had not considered the question or he would not have argued in favor of the local millowner having

access to outside markets, being allowed to cut what he could sell. He had not to pay for it, the licensee having paid. No man would invest in limits under such conditions, and the Province would lose its present timber revenues. Such a proposition meant that the whole system of granting limits to the highest bidders was to be abandoned and no alternative had been suggested by the mover of this resolution. Of course there was no objection to the return and it would be brought down.

Mr. WOOD spoke briefly in explanation, stating that he did not propose that the local millowner should be given unlimited access to outside markets, but that under proper restrictions he should be allowed to realise on lumber cut, even if he had to go beyond the bounds at present allowed him to do it. Instead of an arbitrary price of 15c a standard log, the value to the limit holder should be ascertained and a fair sum only demanded from the mill owner. He was making no charges against the Minister, for so far as he (Mr. Wood) knew the Order in Council was administered with fairness.

The resolution was adopted.

The House adjourned at 4 o'clock.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Dr. Willoughby—On Friday next—Bill for the improvement of Live Stock in Ontario.

Mr. Preston—On Friday next—Bill entitled,

An Act to extend to all landholders' sons the Municipal Franchise.

Hon. Mr. Ross (Huron)—On Friday next—Bill in regard to interest chargeable on drainage loans.

Hon. Mr. Pardee—On Friday next—Bill entitled, An Act respecting Land Surveyors and the selling of Lands.

Mr. Balfour—On Friday next—Bill to amend the Act respecting Line Fences.

Hon. Mr. Ross (Middlesex)—On Friday next—Bill to amend the Act respecting the Educational Department.

Also Bill to amend the Public School Act, 1883.

Also Bill to amend the High School Act, 1885.

Mr. French—On Friday next—Act respecting Landholders and Tenants and distress.