

10 per cent., while the consumption was not more than 2 per cent. Mr. Charlton was convinced that beyond the height of land there was a territory which would make an enormous addition to the timber, mineral and land wealth of the Province. He had no fear of the timber resources being exhausted.

Would Mean Confiscation.

Mr. Charlton prefaced his remarks on the log export question by saying that he was speaking from the purely Canadian standpoint. He had, he said, no interest in the United States. He did invest a little money in a mine in Colorado a few years ago, but he had not since been able to find out where that money was kept. He stated frankly that he was a timber owner on the north shore of Lake Huron, and that he was personally interested in the matter now before the Government. He had no idea what the proposed action of the Government on the question was. The question was, should Ontario forbid the exportation of logs and compel the owners to manufacture in this country? In reference to the timber already sold, he held that the imposition of any restriction other than that already provided for would be a breach of contract and a confiscation of property. As a practical man Mr. Charlton stated that all the money spent in labor connected with getting out the timber and sawing it into lumber was spent in the Province, except 75 cents or \$1 a thousand feet, which represented the labor put upon it at the mills in Michigan. He denied that the 'interview of the Michigan lumbermen' was held in secret. No reporters were present until the interview was over and then he had given to the representatives of three important newspapers the substance of what went on in the meeting. The Government gave the lumbermen no promise, but assured them that the question would receive full and fair consideration. An official reporter from one of the departments was present and took notes of what transpired. Mr. Charlton quoted to the House the concluding paragraph of the official report of the proceedings, which was as follows:—

"In conclusion the Premier thanked the deputation for the manner in which they had stated their views, promising on behalf of the Government a full and fair consideration of the whole question, assuring the gentlemen that the Government were well aware that the question was a serious one for the Province as well as for the American limit holders, and referring to the strong feeling abroad in the country for retaliation."

Mr. Charlton stated the time at which the deputation was received as 2 p.m. on September 7.

Why Was the House Called?

Mr. Whitney commented upon the variety of reasons assigned by hon. gentlemen opposite for calling the House together, none of which agreed with the other. The Globe newspaper

asserted that it was for the purpose of the Government taking Parliament into its confidence with regard to the timber question. He asked whether anybody had seen any sign of such confidence being shown by the Govern-

ment. The statement was misleading and intentionally put forward for the deception of the people and the Legislature; and if it had been true it would have been a distinct violation of the principles of responsible government to have done so. No self-respecting Government could, within the lines of its duty and of constitutional practice, come down to the representatives of the people and say, "We do not know what to do, and we want you to tell us." The answer would be, "Then leave your places and let men take them who know what to do and are willing to take the responsibility." No self-respecting Government would have done so, and his hon. friend the Premier never intended to do so, or if he had so intended he had been better advised since. They had been told also that the House had been brought together to compel him and his supporters to be called here before a sort of tribunal because they had dared to consult with the people of the Province. They had not taken any course or advanced any principle upon the platform which they were not prepared to defend upon the floor of the House. The Opposition was not there to play the game of hon. gentlemen opposite. At length and with great spirit Mr. Whitney asserted his right and that of his colleagues to follow whatever line of action they deemed best, and asserted that he had been informed that hon. gentlemen opposite had been told by their officials that his tour had already caused distinct damage to their prospects. He had, in the 60 addresses which he had delivered all over the Province, spoken with the greatest possible respect for the hon. Premier in his personal capacity, and expressed his regret that the Premier had done him a distinct injustice in giving the House the impression, which the hon. gentleman must have been or ought to have been aware was incorrect, that he had objected to Americans owning timber limits in Ontario. He had never suggested or hinted such an objection. The hon. gentleman had further referred to Americans who were taking logs across to the United States just as his hon. friend who had just sat down was doing.

Not the Party.

Mr. W. A. Charlton—I have never towed a log to Michigan in my life.

Mr. Whitney—I was told so when up in the district of Algoma by a gentleman in whom I have every confidence.

Mr. Charlton—The firm which has been towing logs is that of J. D. Charlton & Company, of which I am not a member.

Mr. Whitney, continuing, said the Attorney-General had given the House the impression that he was interested in an American company which was exporting logs from Canada. That was not so; but his hon. friend or somebody had sent down to the Provincial Secretary's office, where they had no business to go, and brought out the record of the St. Anthony Lumber Company. Mr. Whitney then explained that one share of that company had been placed in his name for business purposes, but he had never attended a meeting of the company or taken any revenue on account of the share. The company in question, he added, had never exported a log and never would,