

should apply to current or future licenses. Mr. Whitney complained, with a suggestion of bitterness in the tone, that the Government had stolen his policy. This charge the Premier easily refuted by showing that the policy had been initiated by the Canadian lumbermen. Mr. Hardy presented an able and complete justification of the course of the Government in dealing with this difficult and delicate question. The Opposition did not divide the House, though it was intimated that a vote would be insisted on at a later stage.

Mr. Ross introduced a bill to make it plain that County Councils may set apart portions of townships as a High School district.

A bill was introduced by Mr. Taylor to facilitate the settlement of disputes between the sellers and purchasers of cheese and butter. It provides that when a dispute arises it may be submitted to an arbitrator to be appointed by the Eastern or Western Cheese and Butter Association.

Mr. Hardy introduced a bill respecting bail.

Mr. Gibson's bill to establish forest reserves was read a third time.

Mr. Hobbs' City of London bill was read a third time, after some verbal amendments.

The Attorney-General's bills to amend the act respecting the public service and to amend the Surrogate Courts act were also passed through their final stages.

Mr. Harcourt's bill respecting the sale of patent and other medicines and of alcohol for the purposes of arts and manufactures was amended so as to apply to companies as well as individuals, and given a third reading. Other bills put through were Mr. Paton's Town of Simcoe bill, Mr. Garrow's Goderich bill and Mr. St. John's bill to authorize the admission of Lewis F. Riggs as a student of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons.

Mr. Harcourt gave notice that the House will resolve itself into a committee to consider the grants to railways.

The Attorney-General's bill to further facilitate the purchase of toll roads by municipalities was passed through committee.

The Timber Bill.

Hon. Mr. Gibson spoke at some length on the second reading of his bill respecting the manufacture of pine cut on the Crown domain. He said that in connection with the statement which he had given of the exports of pine logs, some question had been raised as to the accuracy of the tables he submitted. They were compiled from the Trade and Navigation Returns, and he should have stated to the House that these returns were for the year prior to the year given in the tables he submitted, and for the year from July 1 of each year to June 30 of the next. He submitted a corrected statement of the pine logs exported from Ontario in 1879 to 1896, from June to June, and their value, as follows:—

(Extracted from Trade and Navigation Returns of the Dominion; the fiscal year, from June 30 to June 30):—

Year.	Feet.	Value.
1878-79	72,000	\$ 784
1879-80	2,020,000	13,296
1880-81	2,632,000	20,208
1881-82	1,243,000	15,323
1882-83	1,641,000	11,397
1883-84	964,000	7,906
1884-85	376,000	2,284
1885-86	2,864,000	24,429
1886-87	6,349,000	49,000
1887-88	363,000	3,270
1888-89	10,834,000	94,254
1889-90	32,116,000	261,479
1890-91	36,699,000	313,281
1891-92	73,687,000	631,122
1892-93	125,837,000	1,050,350
1893-94	277,837,000	2,339,276
1894-95	211,745,000	1,659,369
1895-96	137,397,000	1,423,466

He also quoted from the returns to show that there were practically no spruce logs exported from Ontario in 1894.

Criticisms Refuted.

The principal objection taken to the policy of the Government was that it did not go far enough, but he pointed out it could not go further unless it was made applicable at once. They were told that it would lead to a great export of logs this winter, that the limit-holders would say: "Now is the time for us to export an abnormally large cut of pine logs." There would be force in this if the facts bore it out, but they did not, as every lumberman knew. When the men went into the woods they took supplies, etc., based on their estimated cut. The Government had sent out inquiries to their timber agents for an estimate of their cut, and the answers were of such a nature as to warrant the Government in feeling perfectly satisfied that there would be no excessive cut during the present winter. The country would be glad, and the House would be pleased, in view of what had been said by the Opposition, to learn that the cut is estimated not to exceed 156,750,000 feet. (Applause and Opposition laughter.)

Mr. Whitney asked if this was for export or the total cut. Mr. Gibson replied that it was the cut for export.

Continuing, the Commissioner said that the export cut for 1897 was 219,026,000 feet.

He read the following statement showing export of logs for 1897 and estimated export for 1898:—

	1897.	1898. (estimated)
Edmund Hall	8,418,410	7,000,000
Eddy Bros.	12,202,000	10,000,000
Pitts & Co.	19,423,530	None.
Charlton	3,000,000	3,500,000
Booth & Shannon	6,000,000	None.
Albert Pack	8,424,660	None.
Turner & Fisher	12,722,000	15,000,000
Central Lumber Co.	2,500,000	8,000,000
Alger Smith	12,500,000	8,250,000
Wm. Peter	9,000,000	6,000,000
Saginaw Lumber & Salt Co.	7,000,000	5,000,000
Brownlee & Co.	1,270,000	None.
R. C. Lippincott	3,154,570	3,000,000
Munro & Gordon	9,036,636	None.
Holland & Emery Co.	22,000,000	None.
Bliss & Van Aikin	9,000,000	None.
Hardy Lumber Co.	12,027,630	12,000,000
S. G. M. Gates (Union Trust Co.)	2,096,000	18,000,600
Delta Lumber Co.	8,547,700	5,000,000
Hale & Booth	23,000,000	12,000,000
Collins Inlet Lumber Co.	5,206,479	2,000,000