

Saw mills in many districts would have to be closed down if the policy of the Government were to be changed in the direction of holding the timber of the Province. The lumber districts in particular would suffer, whereas now it was a fact that through Parry Sound, Muskoka and Nipissing almost any man who chose to go there, even at the present time, could be provided with work at good wages. Mr. Clancy had spoken with a little more venom than he usually displayed, almost as if he had some personal motive in his remarks. He had expressed to the House his astonishment that the timber sale of 1872 was made without any estimate. So were the 13,000 or 14,000 miles sold before 1872; there was no estimate for them. There never had been any estimate made in regard to any sales before the Mowat Government came into office, save one by Sandfield Macdonald in Muskoka, and that was supposed to have been of a very superficial character. Up to the time the present Government came into office there never had been any proper estimate made. (Ministerial applause.)

Mr. Clancy—That is hard on Mr. Blake.

Hon. Mr. Hardy—Mr. Blake was following the practice of his predecessors. We are wiser now than we were then. My hon. friend, the Attorney-General, is wiser now in this matter than Mr. Blake was then. Mr. Blake is a great man, a great legislator, a great orator; but for carefulness, economy and prudence, Mr. Speaker, commend me to my hon. friend, the Attorney-General. (Loud applause.) Therefore, continued Mr. Hardy, when censure came from the hon. gentleman opposite because there was no estimate made in 1872, in view of the fact that there was also no estimate of sales prior to that date, he unconsciously paid a very high compliment to the present Government. (Applause.) He had drawn special attention to the censure passed by Mr. Clancy on the Government side of the House for the manner in which this sale of 22 years ago had been conducted, because it showed very clearly how weak was the case of those who had to put forward such a matter. The present Government was not then in power, and there was not more than one member who was a member of the House at that time. If the present Government wanted an argument in favor of the course they had pursued surely they had it in the fact that to find ground for blame against them they had to go back for a period of 22 years, to the days of their predecessors in office. (Ministerial applause.)

LIMITS RESOLD.

The hon. member says that large areas of timber limits have been sold which, had they been reserved to the present time, would have brought greatly increased prices and would now have been filling the Provincial coffers. It is true that there have been recent sales of limits between private individuals at very large prices, limits that were sold by the Crown 30 or 40 years ago, before the time of Confederation, when the fixed charge was 50 cents per square mile, or a little later, when the average was \$45 a square mile. For example, the Lumsden, formerly McLaren, limits sold recently for \$400,000, which were originally bought for 50 cents per mile. The Perley & Pattee limits on the Bonnechere, bought for 50 cents per mile, sold for \$750,000. The Dickson estate limits, bought at the same price, sold for \$400,000. The Georgian Bay Lumber Company sold a portion of their limits, bought from the Government for \$50 per square mile, for \$1,000,000, including some lumber, deducting which, the price for the limits themselves has been estimated at \$750,000. These limits were disposed of by the Crown before Confederation, and, of course, prior to the existence of the present Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite would find that the charges they are making would recoil upon the Conservative Government which held the reins of power at Ottawa when these sales were made.

They would pardon him if he gave a little attention to the question of surveys raised by his hon. friend. It had been stated that not one-quarter of the townships surveyed by the Government have ever been occupied by settlers or have been of any practical use. Such statements were simply made at random. If his hon. friend had taken the trouble to inquire he would not have said, as he did at Chatham a year ago, that out of 270 townships which had been surveyed only 76 had ever been settled upon. As a matter of fact there have been 275 townships surveyed since 1873; of which 76 have been set apart for settlement as free grants, while of those in which there are settlers and sales have been made there are 71; of those in which sales have been made for mining purposes, but no settlers, 42; surveyed townships in Algonquin Park, 16; a total of 205 townships utilized out of the 275 surveyed, and leaving only 70 townships in which no settlement had taken place or sales been made. It is not at all unlikely that even in those townships in which no settlement is reported squatters may have gone in, as they so

often do, in advance of Crown lands or formal opening of the lands. His hon. friend had stated, and quite correctly, that a sale of five or six hundred acres in any one of these townships would pay for surveying it. If they were to sell mining lands it was highly desirable that surveys should be made, but while hon. gentlemen opposite were clamoring that the Government should do more for mining at one moment, they were the next throwing an impediment in the way of the industry by demanding that less should be expended for surveys. In Sandfield Macdonald's four years of office his Government expended for surveys \$139,135, an average of \$34,759. Mr. Scott in 1872 expended \$36,911, and the Mowat Government in 21 years \$786,147, an average of \$37,436. Of this sum \$641,268 was for township surveys, and the remainder, \$144,879, for timber limits, base, meridian, boundary and exploration lines, mineral surveys and outlines of townships; and so out of the \$39,000 paid for surveys in 1893 over \$10,000 was for survey of boundary and base lines, timber surveys, etc. He asserted that the Government had not gone ahead too fast in this matter. Many Governments make a complete survey of all their lands, without waiting for long years to complete it. He had corresponded with the authorities of some of the States of the Union to find out what was their practice. He found that in Indiana every acre had been surveyed, and the same in New Jersey, Wisconsin, Illinois, Delaware, Michigan and Ohio. In Minnesota, a new State, all but about one-tenth has been surveyed, and in New York there is an arrangement by which the survey of the entire State is to be completed in ten years. In New York, as is well known, there is a large extent of rocky and broken territory which can hardly be utilized for practical purposes.

Mr. Clancy—That shows you follow a bad system.

Mr. Hardy—It shows that we are following the system which other enlightened nations follow. What is the Dominion method? The public accounts of 1889 show surveys charged to capital account amounting to \$3,419,915, while the revenue derived from lands credited as annual revenue is \$2,130,874.

Mr. Clancy—These were farming lands.

Mr. Hardy—Some of them were unquestionably rocky lands, and some of them were in British Columbia. While we have spent \$641,000 in surveying townships we have received from lands nearly \$4,000,000 during our 22 years of office. The Dominion Government, which spent so much more in surveys, received during their sixteen years only \$2,130,000, or a million and a half less than cost of surveys. Yet he had never heard the hon. member or his leader utter one word of criticism upon any action of the Dominion Government. (Hear, hear.) Another feature to be remarked upon was that while the Dominion Government charged the cost of surveys to capital account they placed the receipts from lands to credit of revenue, while the Ontario Government placed the annual expenditure for surveys, as well as the receipts from lands, to current account. Talk of bookkeeping, of "moral tone," of accuracy in finance, would his hon. friends tell him who was in the right in this matter? Who made a plain statement, such as his hon. friend the senior

member for Toronto spoke of? They could make a plain statement, but they could not make everybody understand it. (Laughter.) Anybody, he thought, could appreciate the difference between the bookkeeping of his hon. friend the Treasurer and that of the Government at Ottawa on this point.

The hon. gentleman said the Province was on the verge of direct taxation. There has been a chronic deficit, enormous waste of capital, gross expenditure; yet, with all this, hon. gentlemen say we do not spend enough on mining. They want more for this purpose. Where is it to come from? In the same breath the hon. gentlemen say we rob the municipalities in taking about one-half of the total amount paid as license fees. The argument of the hon. member for Toronto was that we should give it all to the municipalities, that we are taking our revenue from sources not originally contemplated. They deduct \$290,000 or \$300,000 from our receipts from this source, and they say we do wrong in using the receipts from timber dues and bonuses as revenue; that it is a scandal, a gross waste of the capital of the country. Before proceeding further on that point he would give a challenge to the hon. member—a challenge which had been given before—and would ask the hon. member to name a single representative country in existence on this continent or elsewhere where the receipts from timber taken from the forests is not applied from year to year as revenue. It seemed strange that this argument should have to be refuted again and again. Not a single example of a different system being pursued could be shown. The friends of the hon. member do the same thing at Ottawa without challenge by the Liberals, and the latter would follow the same