Globe
April 1st
128

to the [illegible] by the late Commissioner.

Mr. Murray remarked that the member for Muskoka had made some reference to the views expressed in 1869. But the circumstances of the case differed very materially now from what they were then. Timber at that time was practically valueless, and limits were sold for a mere song. A limit which had been sold recently for one and a quarter millions would have been bought then for ten thousand dollars. Personally he sympathised fully with the settlers, but he thought that the practical effect of the Act as it was proposed by the Minister to be amended, would be beneficial. The land was not entirely denuded of its timber as had been represented. The lumberman left a great deal of young wood, because he had no object in cutting it, and this wood was growing all the time the settler was on the land, and he could use it when he felt disposed. They ought to do all they could to encourage the settlement of the country; at the same time they ought to keep faith with the lumbermen. Under the present law the settler had a right to all woods except pine.

Mr. Meredith—Not all.

Mr. Murray—I understand so. The lumberman does not dispute the fact. The settler sells hardwood, hemlock and other wood, and the lumberman as a rule does not interfere with him, so that the settlers had no great reason to complain. They were getting valuable assistance in the way of opening up the country with roads.

Mr. Wood (Hastings), argued as a consistent advocate of the rights of settlers that the Government ought to remove all grievances under which that class was laboring, for after the lumbermen disappeared and when the revenue from the timber limits was a thing of the past they would have to look to the settler for expenses of Government. The law ought to be changed in the interest of the settler who ought to be relieved from some of the burdens imposed upon him.

Mr. Armstrong declared that when the change was made in the law of 1880 he opposed it. He did not see how they could go back to the old system so far as Muskoka and Parry Sound was concerned, without recouping the lumbermen for any loss they might sustain. As a rule when the lumbermen cut the timber, and if there were any rough stuff left the settler would get the benefit of it. It was true that some slight advantages were given to the settlers. When the settler got his deed he got his refund, and this bill would certainly please a good many by increasing the amount that they would get. But he was inclined to do something more in favor of the settler, and he was in hopes that the Commissioner would see his way to go a little further than he proposed at present to do.

It being now six o'clock, the Chairman of Committee left the chair.

Upon the House resuming Mr. Bronson continued the debate. He submitted that the interests of the settler ought to be respected, but there were other interests requiring consideration. It was the duty of the Government to discourage settlement in the pine district rather than the reverse. The pine districts were now more valuable to the country than if they were agricultural districts. He mentioned that more pine land had been destroyed by settlers' fires than had been cut by the lumbermen. There was no man walking the streets of Toronto, no resident in any part of the Province, who had no rights as regards this timber.

Mr. Blythe spoke of the difficulties the settlers in Muskoka had to contend with, and remarked that the Government could not afford to desert them, for there were so poor they could not be taxed. He thought the Government should refuse further settlement in the county, and they were to be blamed for having encouraged so many to go there already.

Mr. Caldwell pointed out the advantages that were allowed to the settler, the right to cut and sell all timber except the pine, and made out a strong case for the lumberman who paid the Government large sums of money for the pine. If they did away with necessity for residence on the lots, and took that in conjunction with allowing the settler to have the timber, they would have a system of plunder going on that in a few years would leave nothing to the Government. It was absurd to talk of preserving a certain portion of the timber for the settler, because nothing in the world would prevent him from disposing of it. (Ministerial cheers.) Between the honest settler and the lumberman there was no grievance at all.

Mr. Marter, in reply, said he did not mean to state that the settler had a grievance against the Government. The reason why he had not brought this matter forward earlier was that he expected the Minister for Crown Lands would have taken steps to have such an objectionable enactment removed from the statute book. If this matter was used as an electioneering cry by him, it certainly was used as an electioneering cry by the Reform candidate in the constituency—Mr. Cockburn. They stood together in this matter. Mr. Marter then again at some length discussed the nature of the amendments he proposed, and combatted the arguments that had been advanced against them. He displayed a good deal of warmth in resenting the manner the Commissioner of Crown Lands had treated him when he had on some former occasions risen to address the House. When he spoke the other day of the Dulmage matter, and again of the trouble respecting Police Magistrate Spencer, of Muskoka, the Minister took great umbrage at what he said, and used language that he (Mr. Marter) did not intend to submit to. In each of these cases he was justified in saying what he did, and he had, he said, as much right to give expression to his views as the Commissioner had. He certainly thought it was beneath the dignity of the Minister to make those personal attacks in this House. He ventured to say that in this House and in the country his character would stand equal to the Minister's own. He did not know why the Minister should have singled him out for those personal attacks. He and the Minister both came from the same county, and he (Mr. Marter) was as well respected there as the Minister. He would tell him that for the future if he said these things he would not go without reply.

Hon. Mr. Hardy administered a severe rebuke to Mr. Marter for having brought matters before the House upon no better communications to newspapers. The hon. gentleman scarcely ever rose in the House except for the purpose of slandering somebody. Then he was not content with making speeches, but he had introduced the system here of reading newspaper editorials and basing charges upon them. All that he had said of Col. Campbell the other day when he slandered him in the House was founded on what appeared in a newspaper. The practice of reading editorials for the information of the House was a dangerous one, and his hon. friend did not confine himself to editorials, but even took anonymous letters a column and a half in length and read them to the House.

Mr. Marter—The letter I read was signed by a responsible person.

Hon. Mr. Hardy replied that, supposing it was signed, the hon. member had no right to bring it before the House, and he could not blame anybody for holding him responsible for the slander contained in it. But he was informed that there was an anonymous letter read by the hon. gentleman as well, and the statements it contained had been proved to be absolutely false, both by Col. Campbell, Inspector Stevenson, of Muskoka, and the other inspector who gave evidence regarding the matter. He made a long, declamatory statement with reference to the Muskoka magistracy, every sentence of which was denied by Mr. Justice Miller. It was for this reason that he had stated that whenever the hon. gentleman rose, he rose for the purpose of slandering somebody who was not here to defend himself.

After Mr. Marter mentioned that his authority was the editor of The Canada Citizen the matter was allowed to drop.

Hon. Mr. Hardy having replied to some of the remarks made during the debate, the amendment he had moved at the commencement of the debate was then carried. One or two other verbal amendments were also made to the bill.

Mr. Marter then moved his amendments. First he moved as follows:—

Substitute for section 8 the following:—No patent shall issue for lands located under this Act or under the regulations until the expiration of three years from the date of the location, nor until the locatee or those claiming under him or some of them have performed the following settlement duties, viz.:—Have cleared or caused to be cleared, and so prepared for cultivation, at least ten acres of the said land (whereof at least two acres shall be cleared and prepared for cultivation annually during the three years next after the date of the location, to be computed from such date), and have built a house thereon fit for habitation, at least 16 feet by 20 feet, and have as such locatee or those claiming under him or some of them actually and continually resided upon and cultivated the said land for the term of three years next succeeding the date of the location, and from thence up to the issue of the patent, except that the locatee or those claiming under him shall be allowed one month from the date of the location to enter upon and occupy the land, and that absence from the land shall not be held to be a cessation of residence, if the locatee be a resident of the county or district in which the land is situate, provided the land be cleared and prepared for cultivation as provided for in the preceding provisions of this section.

The amendment was put and lost.

Mr. Marter moved again also—That the right of the locatee to cut and use pine trees for the purpose of building and fencing on lands located by him, shall extend to the whole of the lands so located, whether they consist of more than one lot, or parts of two or more lots, and whether the same form part of one or several locations, and so as to entitle such locatee to cut the pine on any part of the lands located by him for use on any part thereof.

This amendment was also put and lost.

Mr. Marter also moved that whenever the quantity of pine timber growing on any located lot is less than fifty thousand feet, such lot shall be withdrawn from license and the locatee shall, on obtaining his patent, be entitled to such timber.

This amendment also was put and lost.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT.

The House went into Committee on the bill to consolidate and amend the local improvement clauses of the Municipal Act. There was a brief discussion on a few of the clauses, which were slightly amended. The bill was reported to the House and the third reading fixed for to-day.

PROTECTION OF EXECUTORS.

The bill introduced by the Attorney-General for the protection of persons acting as executors or administrators was passed through Committee and reported to the House without amendment.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

The Attorney-General moved for leave to introduce a bill respecting the custody of juvenile offenders. The motion was carried and the bill was introduced and read the first time.

KENNEBEC TOWNSHIP.

On the motion of Mr. Hardy the bill to confirm and establish a certain survey of the Township of Kennebec, in the County of Frontenac, particulars of which have already been published in THE GLOBE, was read the second time.

THE TAX EXEMPTION BILL.

Hon. A. M. Ross moved the second reading of his bill respecting exemptions from municipal assessments. The Treasurer went briefly over the points he had enumerated at the first reading of the bill, when the explanation of the bill was given. The principal propositions of the bill are, it will be remembered, to provide for the taxation of educational lands and Church lands, except in the case of educational institutions that are aided by the State; to provide for the removal of the exemption on residences and on salaries up to $1,000, at present enjoyed by clergy and ministers, and to allow the Council of a municipality adopting a business tax (similar to that in vogue at Montreal) in the case of persons carrying on a mercantile business, in place of the present mode of assessment, which frequently causes a good deal of injustice to a man who carries a heavy stock in his own name as against a man who does an equally big business with a stock on which he owes perhaps eighty per cent, and thereby escapes the taxation on more than the remaining 20 per cent.

Mr. H. E. Clarke discussed the bill at considerable length. He accused the Treasurer of simply touching the fringe of the matter, and not going deeply enough into it. He approved