

requirements of the people, and the question was presented to them whether or not they should fix a rate for the timber or adopt the license system there. He took advantage of the information available from the various sources, and the best information he could gather was that there was very little timber in the Lake Superior country, and that probably on nine tenths of the land in that district there was no timber at all. He had ocular proof of that himself when he visited the district. He however had reliable reports before then that the timber was of very little value. He therefore thought it was better that the parties who already held patents should have the privilege of acquiring the timber on their lands on the payment of 75c. per acre. A regulation of Council was brought up on that basis while he (Mr. Scott) was at Ottawa. He afterwards received a communication in which it was stated that 75c. was considered too high, and that 50c. should be substituted. That recommendation was adopted. But very few applications had been made by persons holding patents for the acquisition of the timber. Where there was timber he thought this would be the fairest way to meet the difficulty. It would have been very undesirable, and certainly very provoking and irritating to those gentlemen, if after selling the lands the Government had placed them under timber licenses. An outcry of a most extraordinary character had been raised against the putting of the Muskoka territory under license. Therefore, it would have been particularly objectionable to hon. gentlemen op-

posite if they had given licenses over lands for which patents had been taken out. Parties could, by paying an additional half dollar, acquire the right over the timber on their lands. If there was any timber on the land worth anything, of course the party holding the land would acquire it; if there was not of course they would never sell it. He would be glad to bring down the papers, when they would have an opportunity of more fully discussing the question.

Mr. RICHARDS contrasted the price paid for timber lands on Lake Superior with the price paid for timber berths at the sale last October. One tract on Lake Huron had been sold for \$1,000 a square mile, and in addition to that would have to pay a large sum in the shape of dues. He said that when the mineral lands on Lake Superior were bought it was on the express condition that the timber was reserved, and therefore there could have been no injustice in placing the timber under license. He charged the colleagues of the Commissioner of Crown Lands with not taking any interest in the timber lands of the Province, but leaving the Commissioner to do as he pleased. It was different under the late Government.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he was not aware that any one had private information of a character that would enable him to anticipate the Order in Council. One good evidence that the timber on the mineral lands had not been offered at less than its value was, that although over 200,000 acres of mineral lands had been sold on Lake Superior, not more than 25,000 acres of the timber had been sold under the offer of 50 cents an acre.

Mr. CALVIN contended that if the license system was a good one it should have been followed in this case. He was glad to find the Government coming to his principle of selling the land outright.

Mr. OLIVER said the firm with which he was connected never made any application for the timber till after the Orders in Council had been published.

The motion was then carried.

#### PORT HOPE AND RICE LAKE GRAVEL ROAD.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Durham) moved for a return showing the amount for which the Port Hope and Rice Lake Gravel Road was sold by the Government of the late Province of Canada to the town of Cobourg, the condition of sale, the amount paid on account and the balance due; also, a statement of the revenue derived by the town of Cobourg from the said road since the date of purchase. He explained the position of matters in connection with this road.

The motion was carried.

#### CROWN, CLERGY, AND GRAMMAR SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. RYKERT moved for a return showing—

1. The names of all townships in which reductions have been made, in either the principal or interest due upon Crown, Clergy, or Grammar School lands since February 15, 1871.

2. The date of such reductions.

3. The names of all persons to whom the reductions have been made.

4. The price originally agreed to be paid for each lot.

5. The amount of reduction for principal or interest respectively.

6. The price at which the several lots were valued by the Government Inspector.

7. Copies of all Orders in Council respecting said reductions.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that his hon. friend could scarcely be aware of the amount of work which his motion involved. It would involve the employment of ten or twelve clerks, or all the business in the Department would have to be stopped for some ten weeks. He pointed in detail the reasons for this statement.

Mr. CAMERON thought the bulk would not be so heavy. He proceeded to say that the issue of the circular to the Proton settlers by him when Commissioner was justified by the course taken by the present Commissioner. He thought it very important the return should be brought down.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT pointed out that every individual sale would have to be examined in the books, which would involve an enormous amount of labour.

Mr. RICHARDS said he had heard of lands worth from \$8 to \$10 an acre which had been reduced to 75 cents or \$1. He contended there was no authority for the wholesale reduction of lands which he understood was being made.

It being six the House rose.

After recess,

Mr. DEACON thought they might just as well ask for copies of the books in the Crown Lands Department, as for the return in the shape it was demanded. It would involve intricate calculations and an immense amount of labour in other respects. It would be quite impossible to prepare the return for this session.

Mr. RYKERT said the Government might vote the motion down if they pleased, but it would be an unprecedented course to take. It was no excuse that the return would involve labour and expense—the House had a right to the information.

Mr. McCALL said that in all the cases of reduction that had come under his notice the Commissioner had acted fairly and honestly. He thought it would be prejudicial to the interests of the country if the information asked for was granted, except so far as the settled claims were concerned.

Mr. RYKERT—That is all we want.

Mr. MONTEITH called attention to an instance in which the same quality of land had been placed at quite different prices, by different valuers. Mr. Lewis valued the township of Mornington at \$3, while another valued Maryborough at \$1 to \$1.25. The latter valuation was, in his opinion, correct; and he thought the Commissioner would be doing his duty if he placed Mornington upon the same footing as the township adjoining. He believed the settlers were getting more justice under the present Commissioner than under either of the two previous Commissioners. He thought the return asked for would involve more labour and expense than it was worth. No practical result could follow from it.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said that one of the first duties of the Government was to make those reductions and have the old claims settled. He was delighted to hear the evidence that came from Bruce, Grey, Perth and other counties, and to find that the Government through the Commissioner of Crown Lands was carrying out the policy they had contended for. In three or four years he hoped all the new settlers would have their patents. During the two years the present Government had been in power they had done more to settle the claims of settlers than their predecessors had done during the five previous years. No complaint had ever been made against the Commissioner—no specific case had been made—and under these circumstances he thought it would be unwise to grant the returns asked, and besides they would be of very little use after they were brought down.

Mr. WOOD (Brant) contended that there were cases in which the indulgence of the Crown might fairly be appealed to, but it would be a great injustice to carry out a general reduction. He held that the Commissioner, as a Minister of the Crown, had an inherent right to ask reductions in cases of hardship. It would be a monstrous thing to reduce every unpaid lot without regard to its value and the payment by some parties in full for their land. In his judgment the return would be productive of no good. He again regretted the general reduction, but it