

charge of a house or taxation was imposed on non-resident lands. He (the Atty.-Gen.) knew something about the extent of that taxation from personal experience. He had the misfortune to take, not on speculation; but for an old debt, property costing £1,200 cash. For that 170 acres of land—without improvements on it of any kind—he had been since 1856 from sixty to seventy dollars. Was not that a pretty heavy taxation in a non-resident? But the non-mover let the cat out of the bag when he said that his object was to put on such taxes as would compel the sale of the lands.

Mr. McKELLAR—That is right.

Hon. J. S. McDONALD—What would those persons throughout the country who had invested their means in land in this way, say to such a measure? Here it was virtually proposed to take their property away from them—property in which they had invested in good faith. It was a fortunate thing for the country that the hon. gentleman entertaining these notions—and those who proposed to support him on this occasion—had not at present a seat on the Treasury Benches. Now, the sort of legislation which might be expected of those hon. gentlemen was known; and if no check were imposed on these levellers, it was hard to say to what extent they might not go. First of all, it was proposed to commit the House to the proposition of additional non-resident taxation. By-and-bye if that were conceded they would be asked, perhaps, to make the tax 5s per acre. Now was it that there was some particular lot of land in which the hon. member for Bothwell or some one else was interested,—the forced sale of which, in order that it should come into their possession, was sought in this way? He (the Attorney-General) was sure the house would not be prepared to join in such an onslaught on the rights of individuals investing their means in this description of property. He blushed to find that such a measure could find an advocate in the house—a measure which would do infinite mischief in this country, and give rise to a feeling of the greatest insecurity. He was not prepared to see the rights of property frittered away at the *ipse dixit* of hon. gentlemen opposite, and would say on the part of the Government that legislation of this description ought not to be tolerated for one moment.

Mr. LAUDER, as seconder of the resolution, addressed the house, contending that the progress of the country had been retarded by locking up large lots of land in the hands of non-residents. His idea in seconding the resolution was to assist in compelling the holders of such lands, through taxation or other influence, to offer them for sale. Was it right that any one should be allowed to hold lands in that way, keeping them in an unimproved state, and hindering the settlement and progress of the district? Take the Bank of Upper Canada, which in some townships held hundreds of acres in a block. Was it keeping good faith with the settlers to allow such large lots of land to be shut out from settlement? Did not the settler understand, before making his outlay on his lot, that such monopolies of land were not to be allowed? There were gentlemen in this house largely interested in wild lands, and he was afraid this circumstance might operate, as it had done in the Parliament of Canada, against correct legislation being secured. Non-residents had a right to lie by without paying a shilling of taxes for five years. The lands were then advertised and sold; and there were many instances within his knowledge in which they had not fetched enough to pay the taxes. Why should these absentees not