

then under discussion, but he did not say that it was a proposition which should become law this session. It was a matter which might require a good deal of consideration. A grievance might be felt in the county of Perth, which this proposition might meet; but in many sections of the country such a change might not be necessary. He denied that the Government had pledged themselves to the view that legislation should take place this session. All that was expected was that, if any amendment was absolutely necessary, in order to make the machinery work smoothly, such an amendment should be adopted at once, leaving any material alterations for another session. But the amendments contained in this Bill were not merely of a nature to make the machinery work smoothly; they were amendments to the substance of the law. Mr. Cameron went on to refer to the discussion of Thursday night, characterising the resolution then moved by Mr. McKellar as absurd.

Mr. MONTEITH made some further remarks, urging a change in the statute labour sliding scale, which he said seemed to be passed for the benefit of the rich.

Mr. LAUDER, as the seconder of the resolution characterised by the Secretary as "absurd," said he believed no resolution had been moved during this session, which had received to so large an extent the approval of the House and the country. In illustration of this, he read some resolutions adopted by the County Council of Grey, urging the necessity of such legislation as would make it the interest of non-resident property holders to dispose of their lands. He regretted the course taken by the Government with reference to this Bill, which had rendered necessary the postponing of legislation so much required by the country.

Hon. J. S. McDONALD said he had been charged with the responsibility of defeating two important amendments—the altering of the statute labour sliding scale and the subjecting of mortgages to assessment. He was willing at least to take the responsibility of allowing the country time to consider them. With regard to the former point, he would say that the sliding scale was not for the exclusive benefit of non-residents. Residents might have just the same advantage. As to taxing mortgages, he might approve of it, if it was to be confined to future transactions; but, in any case, those interested and the country generally should have time to consider the proposed change. If we now taxed mortgages, by the terms of every mortgage, the borrower would have to pay the tax. Would it be right to impose an obligation which he had not anticipated when he mortgaged his land? He proceeded to speak in defence of the Canada Company, contending that they had dealt fairly with the settlers on their lands, although they might treat somewhat hardly those land jobbers who purchased property merely for the sake of getting timber on it. The Company was now paying some \$40,000 of taxes—in many cases high taxes on swamp lands of no great value. It was now proposed to make them pay more, and to discriminate against them. Before the House agreed to this, the Company should at least have fair notice of this invasion of their rights.

Mr. MONTEITH dissented entirely from the favourable opinion of the Attorney-General as to the dealings of the Canada Company with the settlers. All he wanted was that they should be taxed on the same principle as others. He did not want to impose on them any special tax.

Mr. McKELLAR vindicated his resolution against the Secretary's charge that it was "absurd." His proposition was that the man who held large tracts of land back from settlement was doing greater injury to the country than the benefit he derived from the assessment he paid, and that a special tax, therefore, should be imposed. The Province of New Brunswick had done exactly what he had proposed the other night, and the system, he was told, had worked admirably. His resolution he had no doubt, if put to the vote, would command the assent of three-fourths of the whole population of the country. He went on to contend in opposition to the Premier and the Secretary, that the present law as to statute labour did discriminate in favour of the absentee.

Hon. J. S. McDONALD said in his own part of the country he took advantage of the clause as a resident.

Mr. McKELLAR said the municipality had no right to allow him to take advantage of it. He hoped this session would not terminate without the discrimination in favour of the absentee being done away with. He

thought the member for Lincoln should withdraw his motion and allow the Bill to go into committee, that the most necessary changes might be proceeded with this session.

Mr. GRAHAM (Hastings) said he had come here as an avowed supporter of the present Government; but if anything had occurred to shake his confidence in them, it was the course they had taken with reference to this assessment law. (Hear, hear). If they had not intended that the Committee should report, and that the amendments which they reported as necessary should be discussed, why did they not say so at the outset? The Government, he thought, had not treated the Committee with that courtesy to which they were entitled. As to assessing lands in block, he would just submit this calculation to the Premier. Assume that the Canada Company owned 50,000 acres in Perth, worth \$20 an acre. This would represent 1,000 days of statute labour. But let this land be cut up into 200 acre lots, with a settler on each, and it would be liable for 3,000 days of statute labour. Let it be cut up into 100 acre lots, with a settler resident on each, and it would be liable for 4,000 days of statute labour. Was it right that the poor man living on his lot should be assessed for statute labour at four times the rate imposed on the wealthy company? He was sorry the Government had taken the course they had seen fit to adopt on this question, but as they had chosen to do so, he thought the chairman of the committee did right to withdraw the Bill and leave the responsibility with the Government.

Hon. J. S. McDONALD did not wish to have it supposed that the Government had assumed an attitude of opposition to the proposed changes. All they said was that it was premature to press them now—that the Government had not as yet fully considered them, and that the country should be advised of what was proposed before legislation took place. He did not wish it to go to the country that the Government were adverse to these changes.

At six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

Mr. McLEOD was compelled to express regret at the unfortunate result of the labours of the committee, the fruits of which at this late hour have been thrown away. He thought that the assessors in the municipalities had not finished their work, because they had anticipated that these amendments would have gone on. He thought that few changes were required, but they were prominent changes, and required immediate attention—for instance, the sliding scale. In former years it had been done away with, and subsequently been adopted in a former chamber. Professional men were not always the best fitted to give practical working to the laws. The industrious classes should not be ignored in their opinions. Millions of dollars would be added if the sliding scale were abolished. On the point of income, it is a sound principle to tax all excess over a certain amount; if under a certain sum it should be exempt. It was never contemplated that the poor man should be taxed for an income which was simply equivalent to an amount necessary to actual living. On the mortgage question he could not see that they should not be taxed as merchandise or personal property. Regarding the subject of non-residents' statute labour, it was a mere matter of time to ensure the proposed changes, and he thought the country would feel aggrieved if the views of the committee embodied in the amendments were not legislated upon this session.

Hon. J. S. McDONALD wished the last speaker to explain what the effect would be upon mortgages.

Mr. McLEOD replied that wherever you find paid-up capital, it should be assessed in equal manner as paid-up merchandise.

Hon. J. S. McDONALD—Who is the sufferer?

Mr. RYKERT—Nobody.

Mr. McLEOD continued that all paid-up capital, in whatever enterprise, should be taxed, and there should be no exemption. There is a difference when a person purchases land, which deserves every deference, and an exemption naturally issues on the balance unpaid, but the class of men who speculate in money, should pay the taxation on such investments.

Mr. LAUDER asked if the lender would not ask more for his money on account of the tax?

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS supposed a case where a mortgage was given for £500 on a farm worth £1,000. The farmer was taxed