

Revenue from timber during the twenty years to be \$14,230,150. This sum includes payments by way of bonus of \$3,612,000, and about one million ground rent, leaving the revenue from dues on timber actually cut \$9,618,000 in twenty years. The true test, however, is the quantity of timber taken out: the bonus is a separate thing. Had the timber not been sold there would have been no revenue from ground rent, whereas about one million dollars had been received during that period from that source. The hon. member had based his comparisons on the amount of money received, including ground rent and bonus, but when the quantity cut from year to year is taken, it can be shown that there has not been such a perceptible increase upon former years as the hon. member seemed to believe. The output in 1869 was 524 millions of feet board measure; in 1872, 678 millions, and in 1893 765 millions, or not quite one hundred millions more in 1893 than in 1872. In 1886 the output was 625 millions; in 1887, 628 millions; in 1888, 781 millions, and in 1889, 818 millions. Four years ago the output was more than it was last year. In 1892 it was 694 millions, and in 1893, 765 millions, or about fifty millions less than in 1889. These figures represent the quantity of timber actually cut and upon which dues were paid. The hon. member would see, therefore, that in order to make the showing which he had made he was compelled to include the large sums paid in by way of bonus, \$3,612,000.

When we come to consider revenue from Crown lands the case is somewhat different, for the reason that the bonusing system is comparatively modern. In 1873 we received as revenue \$832,119; in 1882, \$539,610; in 1886, \$731,845; in 1887, \$1,004,304; in 1888, \$1,652,659; in 1889, \$1,027,531; in 1892, \$2,135,849; in 1893, \$1,858,896.

Mr. Clancy—Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask if the ground rent, bonus and timber dues are not essentially a part of the same thing, growing out of the timber sales?

Mr. Hardy—Ground rents are not bonuses in the slightest degree. When the land is a virgin forest the ground rent of \$3 per mile is still payable upon it. Until the limits are put under license no revenue whatever is derived from them. The dues are paid on the timber when cut. It does not follow that the licensees will cut the timber when they pay their ground rent. They may wait 5, 10 or 20 years, and, in the meantime, the Government is receiving ground rent. The timber taken out from 1873 to 1882, inclusive, was 4,433 million feet; from 1883 to 1892, 6,194 million feet, or an increase of 39 per cent., instead of 83 per cent. The bonuses were, from 1873 to 1882, \$422,890, and from 1883 to 1892 \$3,189,000, or an increase of 654 per cent.

#### TIMBER SALES.

The hon. Commissioner then turned to a record of the timber sales before and since Confederation. Before Confederation there was sold, he pointed out, at the rate of fifty cents per mile, no fewer than 3,904 miles of timber, while there was also sold before Confederation 2,561 miles upon which was paid a bonus of \$116,771, averaging \$45 50 per mile. Thus the total disposed of before Confederation was 12,465 miles. Since Confederation the record of timber sales was as follows:—

The Sandfield Macdonald Government, in four years, 635 miles for \$165,362, an average of \$260 per mile.

The Blake Government, in one year, 5,021 miles for \$592,601, an average of \$117 79 per mile.

Mowat Government, in 22 years, 4,234 miles, for \$5,101,627 75, an average of \$1,205 15 per mile. Thus the total sales since Confederation amounted to 9,900 miles, which, added to the 12,465 miles sold before Confederation, made a total of 22,365 miles sold down to the present time.

The Sandfield Macdonald and the Blake sales were made subject to a ground rent of \$2 per mile, and to dues of 75 cents per thousand feet. Of the 4,234 miles sold by the Mowat Government the terms were as follows:—2,766 miles were sold subject to \$2 per mile ground rent and 75 cents per thousand feet dues; 835 miles were subject to \$3 per mile ground rent and \$1 per thousand feet dues; and 633 miles were subject to \$3 per mile ground rent and \$1 25 per thousand feet dues.

The Sandfield Macdonald Government made four sales in four years, or an average of one every year, and the present Government had made six sales in twenty-two years—one in about four years. Put another way, the Sandfield Macdonald Government sales had averaged 159 miles per year, and the sales under the Mowat Government had averaged 192 miles per year.

The Commissioner referred to the gradual increase in the timber dues and ground rent of the Mowat Government sales shown by this record, and said it was a proof of the way in which the interests of the public had been looked after. Continuing, the Commissioner showed that as between the present Government and preceding Governments the figures quoted show that there were sold during a period of 31 years prior to the time of this Government—1873—

18,277 square miles, the 22 years of this Government 4,324 miles. He took the period of 31 years before the present Government took office because that was the time, about 1841, when the Government of Canada first began to make sales of timber. Of the amount sold before Confederation 3,904 miles were so sold at 50 cents per mile, and 2,561 miles at an average of \$45 50 per mile. During the five years from 1867 to 1873 5,666 miles were sold for \$759,963, or an average of \$133 77 per mile. From 1873 to 1894 under the Mowat Government, 22 years, 4,234 miles were sold for \$5,101,627, or an average of \$1,205 15 per mile. (Applause.)

Looking at this record, the Commissioner asked, could those who were pursuing the Government in connection with its timber policy truthfully say that the Mowat Administration had not carefully husbanded the resources of the Province? Could they truthfully say other than that the timber resources of the Province had been disposed of to the highest bidder at sales by public auction, held only as occasion arose? (Applause.) But the Government had really adhered in this policy to a system which had been approved of by hon. members opposite. He held in his hand a copy of a resolution passed in the Legislature almost unanimously in 1872. It read as follows:—

“Resolved, that this House approves of the policy of the Crown Lands Department, as set forth in the regulations of the department, made in 1869, that ‘the Commissioner of Crown Lands, before granting any licenses for new timber berths in the unsurveyed territory, shall, as far as practicable, cause the section of the country where it is intended to allot such berths to be run out into townships, and such townships, when so surveyed, shall constitute a timber berth; but the Commissioner of Crown Lands may cause such townships to be subdivided into as many timber berths as he may think proper, and the berths or limits, when so surveyed and set off, and all new berths or limits in surveyed territory, shall be explored and valued, and there offered for sale by public auction at the upset price affixed by such valuation, at such time and place, and on such conditions, and by such officer, as the Commissioner of Crown Lands shall direct, by public notice for that purpose, and shall be sold to the highest bidder for cash at the time of sales.’”

Amongst those, continued Mr. Hardy, who voted for this motion of the present members were Messrs. Meredith, Monk and Tooley. (Ministerial applause.)

Continuing, Mr. Hardy said hon. members opposite often urged that if the timber that had been sold had been allowed to remain it would have been worth more now than when it was sold. He supposed it was true. The same argument would apply to many other things, to all the farm land in the country, for instance, and to everything that was sold in a raw state. But those hon. gentlemen who applied such an argument to the timber sales made under the Mowat Administration perhaps did not call to mind the fact that the same thing that applied to sales averaging \$1,200 a mile applied with far more force to the timber sold for 50 cents a mile before Confederation, to the timber sold for \$45 a mile before Confederation, and to the timber sold at \$260 a mile under the Sandfield Macdonald Government. (Ministerial applause.)

There was no argument against the sales of this Government that did not apply more strongly to the sales of previous Governments. This was a progressive question. It began in the early days of the country. The Government of those days sold timber and devoted the revenue to developing the country. They did not say to the settler: “You must not buy land; you must not cut timber for fear Government will get a revenue to expend in developing the country in other directions. It remained for the late hon. member for Toronto, Mr. H. E. Clarke, in a celebrated speech on the budget to put forward the argument that the Government should not dispose of its timber resources nor add to its revenue by so doing. Since then it had been argued again and again by hon. gentlemen opposite, but with no more effect on the people of the country than when it was first advanced two elections ago. It was necessary to sell timber for different reasons—as settlement progressed, as railways come into the territory, as fire threatens. Wherever settlement progressed there would be fires. Take the sale of 1872, under Mr. Scott, to which hon. gentlemen opposite were so fond of referring. Nobody would say the timber would not have brought more money if it could have been saved until now. But what happened? The timber sold covered 5,000 miles,

stretching from Lake Superior almost to Lake Nipissing. Two devastating fires in two years swept over that territory, destroying 2,000 miles of the timber out of the 5,000 sold. Somebody lost, but it was the purchaser, not the Government. The Government had been absolutely bound to sell as settlement progressed. The industries of the country also demanded it.