opinion on it.

Mr. GRAHAME (York) said there were other points, besides those mentioned in the amendment, which required to be altered or reconsidered. He said this, in consequence of communications which he had received from his constituents. He, therefore, moved in amendment, simply, that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration and report.

Mr. McCALL (Norfolk) supported the Bill. He had received communications from his constituents strongly approving of it. Deer were much better in October and November than in December, though not so easily caught. He proceeded to examine the list of petitioners, and asked if James Beaty and Samuel Beaty were hunters (Laughter).

Mr. HAYS asked if they went back into committee and re-modelled the Bill, would they have to go through the same process to-morrow if another petition came in?

Hon. Mr. CAMERON expressed his willingness to accept Mr. Grahame's amendment. When the gallant knight introduced this Bill, he had no doubt done so after full consideration, based on his own experience. Well, the provisions of that Bill were nearly the same as those of his (Mr. Camerons's) amendment. He regretted that the gallant knight had allowed himself to be manipulated in the committee, and yielded his own better judgment as regarded the snipe. The statement that snipes lived in this country was contrary to the opinions of the best sportsmen in the country, He would like to know who had seen a snipe's nest with eggs in it?

Sir HENRY SMITH said the testimony of Mr. Gillet, of Belleville, a barrister well known to the Provincial Secretary, had been given before the committee to that effect.

Mr. SCOTT (Grey) said last summer there were many snipes' nests in the marshes in his county.

Mr. SPRINGER gave similar testimony.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that probably the snipes who had built their nests were wounded and could not leave. (No! no!) He (Mr. Cameron) had been taunted with not being a sportsman. He had not followed sport for 18 years, but he believed he had had more hair-breath escapes than the gallant knight, and still bore in his person evidence of the eagerness with which he had followed sporting at one period of his life. Several of these petitioners claimed to be sportsmen of old standing. George Warren, who had an experience of 25 years; Mr. Maughan, 20 years; Mr. Taylor, 20 years; Mr. Robertson, 10 years; Mr. James Beaty, 50 years (laughter); Mr. Rennardson, 35 years, &c

The amendment, having been put, was negatived by a very large majority.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

FREE GRANTS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. RICHARDS,

The house went into committee of the whole on the Bill, No. 63, relating to free grants—Mr. Coyne in the chair.

The first six clauses were adopted.

The seventh, providing who might be located, having been read—

Mr. BLAKE asked if it was intended that a married woman should be entitled to a grant as well as her husband.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—No.

Mr. BLAKE—Better insert that.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—It will be matter of departmental regulation.

Mr. BLAKE—Is it intended that sons over 18 shall have grants?

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—Yes.

The seventh clause was then agreed to.

The eighth clause, as to the affidavit to be made, having been read,

Mr. BOYD wished the word "chiefly" to be inserted before the words "valuable for its mines, &c.," as in the resolutions. He also wished the words "or timber" left out after "pine trees."

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS agreed to these amendments.

Mr. BOYD objected to the words that the party should not seek the land for the sake of "any quarry or bed of stone."

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS defended this portion of the clause. He said the object was to prevent parties, under the pretence of settlement from going on land unfit for settlement. He knew of a case of a party applying for a lot, on account of a quarry of stone.

The clause was agreed to.

The ninth clause being read,

Mr. BOYD suggested that eight, instead of six months be the time during which the locatee might be absent from his land without forfeiture.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS said six months was the period in the American Acts.

Mr. BOYD.—But here we have longer winters.

Mr. McDOUGALL.—If a person clears 15 acres in one year, will he be considered as having done the settlement duties?

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL—It is not necessary he should cut so much each year, if he cuts the fifteen acres the first year?

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—No.

The clause was agreed to.

The tenth clause having been read,

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS amended it by leaving out the words "and timber" after the words "pine trees" in the first line and the eleventh line, and inserting after the words "pine trees" in the eleventh line, the words, "except for the necessary building, fencing and fuel aforesaid." He said the effect of this amendment was to allow the settler to cut for building, fencing, and fuel, on any part of the lot (Hear, hear).

Sir HENRY SMITH said that, by the last two lines of the clause, the whole of the timber should go to the patentee. Was it intended to reserve a stone quarry after the patent issues?

Hon. J. S. McDONALD—No.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS said it was originally proposed to reserve all minerals and all growing pine trees for the Crown. He had given up the trees to the patentee, but all quarries of stone and everything else, except trees, were to remain with the Crown.

Sir HENRY SMITH said he had never heard of such free grants—that a man, wanting to build a chimney, should not be allowed to take the stone for it off his own land. Surely, if there was stone on a man's land, he should have the benefit of it. He protested against this reservation. It was not in the resolutions agreed to by the committee.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—In all the old patents, pine timber was reserved. But he had never heard of the Crown enforcing that prohibition. So, if there was any stone on the patentee's land, not of any particular value, he supposed the Crown would never claim it. But the fact of the reservation would prevent people from going on these lands except for agricultural purposes. However, as the gallant Knight was so anxious about the quarries of stone, he would let them go, as well as the pine, to the patentee. (Hear, herr).

Mr. BEATY thought there should be no reservation at all.

Mr. FERGUSON said, according to this clause, timber dues must be paid on any pine cut in the clearing. A settler, therefore, would say to himself:—"If I clear 30 acres I will have to pay dues, but if I remain idle for five years I will get the timber free." It was a premium on idleness. A man who would only cut fifteen acres in five years must be a miserable settler. And yet, this was what the Government policy confined him to. When he (Mr. F.) went into the bush, he cleared 100 acres in two years.

Mr. McKELLAR—All alone?

Mr. FERGUSON—With some help,

Mr. BOYD said that surely the interpretation put upon the clause by the member for Simcoe must be wrong.

Sir HENRY SMITH—I understand, if a man chooses to cut the pine timber before getting his patent, he has it, on paying the dues.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—If he cuts it in the course of his clearing.

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH—You don't mean to make him pay dues on what he cuts, on ground he is actually clearing?

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—Certainly, if he disposes of the timber he cuts.

Mr. PARDEE—Suppose he burns it up?

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—Then he won't have to pay.

Mr. PARDEE—You discourage him from turning it to profitable account. You hold out a premium to the man to be shiftless.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—He can sell it to lumbermen at a bonus over the Government dues.

Mr. McKELLAR said it struck him that the whole Bill was wrong in principle, from beginning to end. In the first place, the Government were to give these grants in districts which were not good for agricul-