

license system. He noticed it as a strange thing that so many of the hon. gentlemen who had spoken in favour of this Bill were lumbermen, and naturally opposed to the interests of the settlers. If there was one thing which would show that lumbermen should be prevented from voting upon a measure in which they were so deeply interested, it would be the present discussion.

Mr. FRASER—What would you do with the lawyers? (Laughter.)

Mr. MEREDITH—Lawyers are differently situated. (Laughter.) He claimed that this Bill, by giving the lumbermen the right to go into a settlement at any time and strip off the timber, would seriously hinder the settlement of the country.

Mr. PARDEE said the leader of the Opposition a few days ago proposed to reduce the number of members of this House, and now he went a little further, and wanted to exclude lumbermen altogether. If they went that far, they might as well go further and exclude gentlemen of other occupations as well. The hon. gentleman had referred to the views of Mr. McKellar in 1868; but no other member of the Opposition of that day agreed with Mr. McKellar. The position of the settler had entirely changed since 1868. At that time there were very few colonization roads, and since then \$1,200,000 of public money had been spent in opening up that country. From the way some hon. gentlemen talked, it might be supposed that the Government were introducing some new principle. They were doing nothing of the kind; they were merely proposing to extend the principle laid down in 1868 by John Sandfield Macdonald, whom hon. gentlemen opposite so slavishly followed. He read from the Act then passed, which provided that all pine lands, with the minerals upon them, should be the property of the Crown, except that the locatee should have the right to cut what pine he required for the purpose of building and fencing. (Cheers.) A subsequent section provided that if the timber was not taken off the land in five years, then all that remained would belong to the patentee. What was the intention of the Government and the Legislature who passed that Bill? The discussion which took place showed that they believed five years would be quite sufficient to enable the lumbermen to take off all the timber on the land—would in fact be just as well, so far as the revenue was concerned, as to reserve the pine altogether to the Crown. This Bill reserved all the pine for the purposes of revenue, allowing at the same time to the settler all that he required for the purpose of building and fencing. It made no change whatever in the law except reserving the pine indefinitely, instead of for five years only. This was not a question at all as between the lumberman and the settler. It was a question simply between the Province and the public, including the settler as a part of that public, and in dealing with it they ought to deal with it from a Provincial standpoint only. The people living in the counties of Oxford and Middlesex had just as much interest in the revenue obtained from that country as the people themselves who lived there. Therefore it was taking a narrow view of the question to say that it was one simply between the settler and the lumberman. He contended that this indefinite reservation of the pine was more in the interest of the settler than the reservation made under the old Act, because it was impossible in five years to take out the lumber judiciously and prudently. The interests of the lumbermen and the settlers would be mutually served by the Bill, and it would be to the interest of both to conserve the lumber, and thus promote the public revenue. During the past twelve years the Province had received from woods and forests no less than \$5,370,000 (cheers), but unless they took the course proposed by this Bill, he ventured to say that in three years hence our revenue from that source, which was now half a million a year, would not amount to \$100,000. (Hear, hear.) It might be asked why not sell more timber limits. Because it was not in the public interest. Unless such a measure as this was passed it would be impossible for

the Government to put new townships into the list for location, and it would be next to impossible to work the Free Grant Act at all. The hon. member for East Grey had suggested that the land should be cleared off by the Government before opening it for settlement. He would ask anybody who knew anything about it if this could be done. Under the present timber arrangement it was impossible to get the townships open for location. It might be asked why these lands were not put under license, but if a man were once located the timber could not be sold over his head.

Mr. MERRICK spoke at some length, and quoted from speeches made by friends of the present Government favouring the sale of the timber as well as the land to the settlers.

Mr. FRASER, in reply, quoted from speeches by John Sandfield Macdonald favouring the policy of retaining the timber for revenue purposes.

The motion was then put and carried on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Baxter, Blezard, Bonfield, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Cook, Crooks, Dryden, Ferris, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Huron), Hardy, Hawley, Hay, Hunter, Lees, Livingston, Lyon, McCraney, Mack, Miller, Mowat, Nairn, Neslon, Pardee, Paxton, Peck, Robinson (Cardwell), Robinson (Kent), Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Waters, Waterworth, Widdfield, Wood—41.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baker, Baskerville, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Creighton, French, Graham, Har-kin, Jelly, Lauder, Macmaster, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Morgan, Morris, Murray, Near, Parkhill, Richardson, Tolley, Wigg—24.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. HARDY presented the report of the School of Practical Science for 1879, the report of the Council of University College for 1879, and the statement of income and expenditure of the Agricultural and Arts Association for 1879.

In reply to Mr. Meredith,

Mr. MOWAT said the Bill relating to exemptions from taxation was now in print, and would probably be submitted to the House on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. WOOD announced that he expected to be able to bring down the Public Accounts for 1879 on Tuesday.

The House adjourned at 10:50.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Waterworth—Bill to amend the Act respecting Ditching Water Courses.

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton)—Bill to amend the Liquor License Act.

Mr. Striker—Order for a return of railways receiving aid from Provincial funds since 1870, the route of each, &c.

Exemptions from

Public

Jan 30

Revisions

Taxation

Accounts