

done. With regard to the latter part of the question, the price to which the Government intended to reduce, he was sorry to say, depended a good deal upon the township and individual lots. There was a vast variety of cases. A good deal depended also upon the re-valuation, which, in most cases, was exceedingly defective from want of uniformity. It was a matter of time, but he hoped to be able to effect an improvement.

TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. RYKERT moved the following resolution:—That the House do resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following resolutions:—1. That hereafter no licenses to cut timber upon the wild lands of this Province shall be granted, until such time as the said lands shall have been explored and surveyed, and a full report of the quality and quantity of the timber growing thereon, together with a description and nature of the soil, shall have been filed in the office of the Crown Lands Department. 2. That no licenses to cut timber upon the wild lands of the Province shall be granted (except for such quantities as shall be required by the actual settler, and for local consumption), until the Order in Council respecting the same shall have been confirmed by this House. The

speaker remarked that this motion was not open to the objection that had been raised against a previous motion of his, that he was moving a vote of want of confidence in hon. gentlemen opposite; but he felt it to be very important that on the timber question and the disposition of our wild lands honourable gentlemen could make up their minds to have a definite policy, and settle the matter for ever. It was highly important that it should be settled by legislative enactment; it was, in fact, necessary that we should have declared in such a manner what the policy of the Government was in regard to it, though he did not attempt to censure the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the course he had taken. Yet it was important that the House should declare whether or not it was prepared to allow any Commissioner to sell a large portion of our public domain. The whole country was alive to the importance of the question before the House, and it would be necessary for him to review the policy of the Government during last summer. So far as he was concerned that policy was not going to be condemned by him. It had been the policy of all Governments for years to look to the settlement of the country—that had been their aim. He had heard honourable gentlemen say that the importation of one person to the country was equal in value to a hundred dollars; and if so much could be placed to the credit of the country—if our welfare could be so much increased by immigrants, it was desirable that there should be facilities for encouraging them to come here. The first motion made in the Ontario Legislature was upon this very question. The feeling of the country now was that the settlement of our wild lands should be well looked to, and that we ought to prevent waste of our timber, and that had been the policy of our Governments. It must also be borne in mind that other countries were looking to the same view, and had restricted the wholesale slaughter of the forests. Petitions had been sent to this House praying that the waste of the public domain be curtailed. In 1863, when the whole question was thoroughly discussed in the old Parliament, a Committee was appointed to inquire into it, of which the present Commissioner of Crown Lands was a member. Evidence was taken before that Committee which resulted in a report being presented to the Legislature, stating that there should be some enactment by which the rights of the settler should be distinguished from those of the lumbermen. The question was asked whether the rights of these two parties would conflict, and it was said that the rights of the settlers would be materially affected so long as the Government allowed indiscriminate settlement upon the lands. The Committee recommended that care should be taken to find out, by explorations and surveys, what kind of land it was before being thrown open for settlement, so that settlers could not be placed upon land not fit for occupation; that the Government should endeavour to lay aside that land fit for settlement, and that sought for by lumbermen. The result of the discussion in the Ontario Legislature was in favour of the view expressed by the report of the Committee in 1863. The policy of the late Commissioner for Ontario was that the Government's interests should be amply protected as well as the settlers' and that policy was approved of by the present Commissioner. It was then declared that this House should express what its policy was upon this question. A great deal of fault was found that the policy was altered in regard to mineral lands, and THE GLOBE of January 24th, 1868, said that the country had a right to ask that the Legisla-

ture should deal with the question, and that the regulations with regard to the mineral lands should be a matter of statute law, and not of departmental or Executive order. That view was generally entertained; and during the debate in the House the Commissioner of Crown Lands expressed himself in favour of having timber licenses possess a certain tenure extending for twenty or twenty-one years.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That was always my policy.

Mr. RYKERT replied that he thought the honourable gentleman's view was not then that the lumbermen should have unlimited license to run over all the wild lands of the Province, but that he would limit the licensee in the quantity to be produced yearly, and he contended it would be to the interest of the country to do so. He proceeded to read extracts from THE GLOBE, to the effect that the Crown lands should not have been sold in Muskoka without the consent of Parliament, and argued that the much more extensive sale of last October should not have been effected without the express sanction of Parliament. He read an extract from a report of Mr. Allan Gilmour, in which that gentleman stated that the best plan for the Government to pursue was to survey the territory before the timber limits were disposed of. That was an authority that the Commissioner of Crown Lands would not dispute, and yet he disposed of a vast territory without any survey. He argued that the Government should reserve those sections that are fit for settlement for settlers and not dispose of them to the lumbermen. He read long extracts from Mr. Salter's report, recommending a survey of the territory. He held that the selling of the timber limits was altogether uncalled for, and it certainly should not have been done until a complete survey of the territory had been made and the sanction of Parliament had been given.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he was very glad that this question had been brought up. It was one that could not be too often discussed on the floor of Parliament. He had for years advocated an improved timber policy, and had his suggestions been adopted fifteen years ago, in his judgment the country would be worth a good many millions more than it was. But it was one of those questions which could never be ventilated in the old Parliament of Canada. The Quebec Government were the first to adopt a fixed ground rent instead of compelling the licensee to cut his timber on every berth, and the Government of Ontario followed in 1868-69. That was a move in the right direction, but it was only a small part of the policy he had advocated. One policy which he had advocated with the view of preserving our timber was to extend the time to the lumberman for cutting his timber from a single year to a long series of years, subject, of course, to such regulations as to settlement as the interests of the country required. It took a long time to bring about that change, but finally it was effected. It was adopted last session by the Dominion Parliament in regard to the lands in the West. It was a policy he had advocated fifteen years ago, and the object of it was to induce the lumberman to husband his timber. The whole question of the management of the timber lands was one which few men in this country understood, and the hon. member for Lincoln, in discussing it, furnished an illustration of the truth of the lines:—

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not of the Pierian spring."

His hon. friend had committed this mistake. He had fancied that the pine lands and the lands fit for settlement were in separate sections. Now, what was the fact? He unhesitatingly asserted that there were very few sections which contained valuable pine lands that did not also contain a very considerable portion of lands fit for settlement. The two kinds of land were so blended that it was simply impossible to separate them. From the observations of the hon. member from Lincoln it would seem that he supposed there were large blocks of pine lands, and separate blocks of lands for settlement. Such was not the case except in a very few instances. The way these lands were intermingled it would cost this country millions to divide the lands and allot one particular part for settlement and another part for lumbering purposes. He proceeded to give several instances in which the pine lands adjoining lands that were settled had turned out to be very valuable, and had been purchased by the neighbouring settlers, showing that the timber lands and the arable lands were mingled together. In view of this fact, the way to promote settlement was to put the whole land under licenses, and then it would be the interest of the