PARLIAMENT

AS TO FOREST RESERVATION AND PRESERVATION.

Hansard Report, June 8, 1908.

Mr. Foster—I remember that in this House not long ago a speech was made by my hon. friend the minister of the interior in which he took up as one branch of this subject the question of forest reserves and showed the immense importance of having forest reserves made, and made quickly so that there should not be any longer delay. He was good enough to refer at that time to some remarks on the same subject, and I understood that the government and the minister of the interior very heartily subscribed to those ideas as they were brought out in the general discussion in the House. If the minister has done nothing it rather goes to support what was said in the debate in the House some four months ago that whilst information has been "being gathered" and while the statements have been favorable to such a policy the Dominion government is letting year after year pass practically without doing anything. Of course it is of no use to have forest reserves unless the government at the same time go in for a system of preserving the water flow of the country as well, that is setting apart the reservoir sites so that the waters which would otherwise be wasted in overflows might be preserved and be made very useful in the later time when the water was more necessary. The minister knows very well that the United States government has spent millions of money and inaugurated a really wonderful policy in that direction taking hold of the forest slopes and of the arid regions and by a system of water dams or reservoirs really turning millions of acres, formerly arid and of no use, into very eligible lands which they are selling at a large advance and out of which they will recoup themselves for all the expenses they have gone to and more. But what is of more importance is that at the same time they are keeping the forest reserves and turning arid lands into splendid agricultural lands and thus filling up the country with a very eligible population who go to these lands and do small farming in a tidy and intensive way, making themselves the best producing citizens in the agricultural line.

The minister today tells us that there are only three reserves, one of them the Banff, which we have had ever since we remember anything almost in our Northwest history, then this little picayune Watertown one, a township or a township and a half which really can hardly be called a reservation and the other one intersected by the national transcontinental railway. Those are the three at the present time and that is all we have. Does the minister not think that this is one of the most important questions that could engage the attention of his department and does he not think that most valuable time is passing while he is doing nothing? Is there not the possibility that the timber areas and water supplies will have passed into the hands of private parties before the government inaugurates a comprehensive policy of reserves? The minister comes from the west and knows that there is nothing which so agitates the people of that country and will agitate them as this very question. I read a most striking statement by Professor Robertson not more than three weeks ago in which he really called a halt to the self-glorification in which we have been indulging as to the mighty things we are doing in the west. He pointed out that we are in reality doing nothing in the west except shearing the fleece off and making no return or preparation for subsequent growth, that there is nothing like intensive farming and really no proper guarding of the reserves in water, forests and coal, but that we are simply taking all that comes in sight and laying up no reserve force for a rainy day. That process has taken place in the United States and the United States government has only recently, under President Roosevelt, taken up that large and broad system of reserves and of bringing in to the assistance of nature, natures forces, which heretofore have been allowed to go to waste and to become destructive.

Now, we in Canada cannot commence too soon in that business. The fertility of our Northwest depends on our taking care of our forest reserves and looking after our resources of moisture. In the southern states and throughout the western state the immense losses from sudden overflow are year after year becoming more and more onerous, and men who give their attention to the subject point out that these losses arise very largely from the denudation of the forest areas. We cannot commence at this work too early; yet I am afraid that the minister is pottering around on non-essentials instead of giving full force to this very important consideration. Some one persuades him to build out here a sort of Castle of Chilion in which to immure fifteen or sixteen astronomers who will try to discover a new ring around a planet or the tail of a comet in some far-off nebula. $150,000 has gone into that venture; but $150,000 put into this other matter would yield greater results to this country, and the stars might be allowed to cavort around a little longer without being subjected to the inspection of peering eyes. A man comes to a minister with a telegram, and we build a mint, and spend $600,000 on it; and now we have the mint, and we shall have the loss forever and a day. In the meantime our western country is crying out for the preservation of those things which are essential to its growth and its continued prosperity. The minister is not doing much, though he is doing something. He takes particular trouble to secure a herd of three or four hundred buffalo at immense expense. It is nice to have the buffalo, but they will not form water reservoirs or keep the forest tracts of the country where they should be. All these things have their proper place, but it seems to me that if we neglect this matter of forest preservation, we neglect the greater thing while bestowing a great deal of pains and cost upon subsidiary things.

Mr. Oliver—A mistake has possibly arisen from confusing the two words reservation and preservation. There is not much difference in the words themselves, but there is a vast difference in the meaning of the words.

Mr. Foster—One is necessary to the other, isn't it?

Mr. Oliver—That is where my hon. friend and I do not altogether see alike. My hon. friend seems to think that reservation is preservation. I do not think that it is necessarily so. With regard to the preservation of the forest areas along the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, I would not wish my hon. friend to suppose that the subject has not been considered; but it has been considered with this in view, that we have a Forest Reserve act, passed with a view to certain conditions, and we find that the conditions prevailing along the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains are such as hardly to make it advisable to apply the provisions of that act along the whole slope. We have there deposits of coal of stupendous amount and value; but they are of no value unless they are operated, and the purpose of the government is, so far as it has any connection with the matter, to secure their operation to the limit. We want as much of them as possible operated as soon as possible. I think I am safe in saying that that is the view taken by the government.

Mr. Foster—As much as is necessary for the country' need.

Mr. Oliver—As much as is possible to be operated; because we believe that we have coal to spare to all the world and that the operation of these coal measures for an outside market would add greatly to the wealthy and prosperity of our country and not do ourselves any harm. If the little country of England, with its large population and its stupendous industrial requirements, all dependent on the use of coal, as ours are not, owing to its water-powers, can afford to ship coal to all the world that will buy it—and it is as a matter of fact shipped to all the world, even to its most remote corners—we in Canada, with a coal supply in comparison with which that of the British Isles is insignificant, can very well afford to take the same view and make what money we can out of our coal as opportunity offers. The application of our Forest Reserves act and its limitations to the area to which we look for the operation of our coal measures and the general industrial development along the base of the Rocky mountains. That, however, does not exclude a policy of forest preservation or of reforestation with a view to preserving both the water supply and the supply of timber. From this explanation my hon. friend will see that there is not so very much difference between the statement as it appears in the newspaper and the statement I presented to the House.

As I said a few moment ago, the hon. gentleman seems to think that reservation is preservation. That is what point I want to take very direct issue with him. We must give opportunity for the investment of capital and the application of energy, enterprise and intelligence in the turning to account of our natural resources, or our natural resources are not worth anything to anybody. They are not worth reserving or preserving unless there is capital and intelligence and energy and opportunity to a reasonable degree to turn them to account. In the United States at the present time and under present conditions, with the stupendous development of population, of wealth, of industry which has taken place in that country, after having shorn the fleece of 99-100 of its value, they may very well turn round and adopt a policy of preservation, or reservation if you like, in regard to the balance. The time has come when that may very well be a leading policy of the government of that country. But had that policy been adopted when the United States had only a population of 5,000,000 people, had it been then announced that there would be policy of reservation for the sake of preserving the natural resources of that country throughout all its vast area, we would have had to wait several thousand years for the development that has taken place. There has been a waste, if you like to call it so of the natural resources of the United States, but there has also been there the most phenomenal development the world has ever seen; and I am under the impression that, for the present at any rate, while we should have due care for the preservation of our natural resources, we should also see that there is ample opportunity for the employment of capital and labour in the development of those resources and in turning them to account as contributions to the wealth and prosperity of the country.

Mr. Foster—At the risk of taking up a few moments more I want to put another view. I do not agree with my hon. friend in the main. I still hold that reservation is absolutely necessary for preservation. I do not mean that the government should stretch its hand over every bit of natural resources we have and lock them up from any private or corporate development. That would be the climax of absurdity. But if you are going to preserve a sufficient amount of our natural resources, you have to begin now. Suppose you give to every corporation and individual with capital to invest all our natural resources, suppose you hurry to put every bit in their hands, what will you have for yourself? Now is the time for the government to decide what it ought to reserve and reserve that portion. My hon. friend says, speaking of coal, that the government cannot make these reservations because there are coal areas upon them. But it is quite possible to reserve your coal areas and administer them as they ought to be administered. I do not think it should be the policy of any government to get as many of those coal areas as possible into the hands of capitalists. These are the country's own resources and the country has a perfect right to their usufruct. As they belong to the people, the people have the right to parcel them out as they please with the object of letting the government have at least its fair share of the profits. It is not necessary to give capital all the profit from these areas in order to have them developed. Mr. Whitney did not take that view, and his policy has been of great advantage to the province of Ontario. Under the old policy, the mining areas were sold at $3 an acre. Whoever applied for them and complied with the conditions got them at that rate. Mr. Whitney reserved, however, certain portions of the Cobalt area absolutely to the government and allowed no prospecting upon them. He had them prospected himself, through the government officers, and there is not the least doubt that there is a patrimony stored up in those reservations of millions and millions of dollars which will ultimately go into the treasury of Ontario. Is not that the proper policy? But if my hon. friend's contensions were carried out, Mr. Whitney would sell these areas at $3 an acre in order to bring in capital for the development. Take Cobalt Lake, for instance; there was supposed to be beneath the lake, which is 25 to 40 feet in depth, mineral leads of different qualities, because all along the sides these leads had been prospected. If the old government had been in office, under its policy the 40 acres would have been sold for $120. But Mr. Whitney did not do that. He put them up for sale and tender and he got $1,087,000. And there was no difficulty in getting capital to come in. My hon. friend asked what would the United States have been if they had adopted such a policy? Why, the wealth of the United States people would be today immeasurably greater than it is if thirty or fifty years ago they had reserved a great portion of their natural resources in timber lands, coal lands and mineral lands and had kept them until the present to be operated by corporations or private parties or the state as they might think best. And the one thing which the best people in the United States deplore today in connection with this great question of capital and labor—the few rich and the many poor—is the improvidence of the state in having put its great natural resources into private hands instead of keeping them for the public good and giving the people their share of the profits. My hon. friends is anxious to get the coal areas in the Northwest opened up so that we may export our coal into every country in the world. I do not think that any well-wisher to the people is anxious for such consummation. He says that Great Britain has been exporting its coal a century and more. So it has, but today the British people are up against a coming failure of their fuel supply, and before many years you will find the people of England very chary of selling for export the only available fuel reserves they have. Canada is supposed to exist for more than a hundred years, for more than twenty-five centuries, and I am not at all anxious that we should use up our coal reservations in the Northwest by sending out our coal to every country in the world in order to realize immediate profit. Our great natural resources are as much a national defence as the arms which we put into the hands of our soldiers. In this great competition between nation and nation, when coal is the only fuel we have left, the last thing in the world that Canada should do is to denude itself of its coal areas. If we should, future generations will curse the policy which disembowelled the earth of its fuel resources and distributed them to strangers for the sake of the little profit obtained at the time.

I believe that a country has just as good a right to defend itself by keeping its great coal area to itself, keeping its great coal area to itself, for the same remark applies to these—as it has to engage in any other defensive measure. Why should we hurry and rush to get our timber cut down and exported in exchange for a small sum of money, when, for centuries to come, our own people in increasing numbers will want timber? Rather we should regard this as a trust held in trust for the future, and we should make it a policy that not one stick of timber shall be taken off without making sure that another is growing to replace it. Reforestation rather than a spendthrift destruction for export of these natural resources should be the policy of the country. I think my hon. friend to think over these things in the night watches, to consider what I have said and see if he cannot revise his opinion, and, by all means, get a hustle on and reserve these water resources, timber resources and mineral resources as far as possible. One thing more I would like to ask him; is he taking any steps in regard to the large forest areas that have already gone into private hands, so as to have regulations made by which these forests shall be perpetually kept up? They have been granted, and for a song, and it will add, of course, to the value of the grant if the government makes regulations which make the supply perpetual; but the country has so great an interest in the matter that I would rather see this than see it left in the hands of speculators to denude these areas of their timber. I think the minister ought, with all the wisdom there is in his department, to give his attention to how it is possible to preserve every acre of timber and prevent it being denuded, keeping it as a prepetual producer for the benefit of the people of this country, even though the benefit inures directly to the individuals who, at the present time, are the fortunate possessors.

Mr. Oliver—My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has placed a proposition before the House which appeals to my mind as being one of both having your cake and eating it as being one. I do not think he has been able to make clear how that end is to be arrived at. He said that, if the United States fifty years ago, had adopted a policy of reservation in regard to its natural resources, that country would have been vastly richer today. We cannot tell what would have been the case had a certain policy been adopted fifty years ago. But I submit that the most valuable asset of the United States—admitted in all the rest of the world and admitted in the United States as well—is the individuality, the energy, the enterprise, the industry of the people of the United States. And, had it been the policy of the government of the United States at any stage of the history of that country—a policy which, of course, would have been impossible in the temper of the people—to put up the bars against the exercise of the energy, enterprise and inventive spirit of the people there could not have been the development, the prosperity, the success that there has been. If it is because the forests have been cut down, it is because the earth has been "disembowelled" of its coal and of its iron, it is because these natural resources have been turned to the uses of man that the United States is as it is today. Take the case of Ontario, this very country. Given conditions as they are on the continent of America today, outside of the province of Ontario, and the province of Ontario would be more valuable if it were covered with the trees with which it was covered a hundred years ago than denuded of its trees as it is today. But had the province of Ontario and the rest of the continent remained covered with trees during all these years, there would have been no value in the province of Ontario today. You must give opportunity to the application of energy, intelligence, enterprise and industry, or you have no value. What I am trying to impress upon the minds of hon. members is that the natural resource has not, of itself, any value, it is made of value by the application of the energy, intelligence and industry of man, so as to meet the needs of many in that way and in no other. There is a time coming—it possibly has come in the history of the United States, and it is coming in the history of Canada—when there will be a sufficient aggregation of accumulated wealth and of population and of surplus energy, for a policy of reservation and preservation of the natural resources that remain to be entered upon. But I submit that the fact that this time has arrived in the history of the United States is no evidence that it has arrived in the history of Canada. It is, however, a fact that we would be unworthy of our position if we did not learn by the experience of others. Recognizing what has taken place there, we may recognize also what has been done to couple preservation with enterprise, and that is the object of our policy at the present time. We hope to achieve a reasonable measure of preservation of our natural resources so that they may be turned to useful account; not by a policy of reservation that would prevent them being turned to account by the energy, enterprise and industry of our people.

Any policy dealing with the disposition of the timber should have as a part of that policy the reproduction of the forest. That is, I may say, a part of the policy of this government, although not yet developed as highly as we hope it will be at some later time. There are many things to learn in regard to this matter. We have not yet been able to form a scientific system with regard to the widely varying conditions prevailing over our vast territory. We may be going too slowly, but we have to consider the public purse, and we do not like to ask for large sums until we feel that we can assure parliament that we are going to get value for the expenditure. The timber which is under the control of the Dominion government, I may say, is but a comparatively small part of the total timbered area of Canada. Under the previous regulations the principle was the same as that which prevails in regard to coal, that is to say, that the first comer got it on application, subject of course to sale by tender. But now we hold practically the whole of our timber under reservation, and we only offer it for sale when we be satisfied that the public interest requires it. That is an important difference between the former system and the present one. Formerly our timber was open to the first applicant. We did not have to put it up, it is true, but our practice was that the timber was offered to the first applicant. Now we advertise it to the world when we think that the public interest will best be served by putting up any part of it. This system actually places the timber under reservation.

In regard to the reproduction of the forests, or the reforesting of the present forest area, let me say that while the forest is valuable and while the reproduction of the forest is valuable, the land is also valuable for agriculture. Where there is an area of country that today is covered by merchantable timber that is required for the use of the people, and when that timber is cleared off the land is valuable for farming purposes, it is a question whether we would be warranted in all cases in insisting upon the reforesting of that area off. It is no secret that the Dominion of Canada, in its stupendous area, is not all fertile; but I do not think I can be charged with decrying the country when I say that there are also vast areas that are not suitable for agriculture, but which, in many cases, are covered by timber and in some cases by timber of great value. Now under these circumstances if there are immense areas of country covered by timber the land of which is of agricultural value when the timber is cleared off, it would be a fair proposition to say that we should limit our efforts at reforestration to some extent at least, to those areas that are not valuable, or less valuable for agricultural purposes. That is the policy of the government. There is in the railway belt of British Columbia, where the greater part of the timber supply at present available is situated, and which is under the control of this government, very limited areas of most valuable agricultural land which is today covered by timber of great value. There is, however, in that same area a very large proportion of the land covered by timber which land is of much less agricultural value. My view is that when the timber is cleared off land that is of especial agricultural value, we should not undertake to reforest it. At the same time we should have a well-defined and aggressive policy of reforestation in regard to the land not suitable for agriculture, and I will be glad to bring before the House such a policy as soon as we have information at hand, and are able to present a system that we would be warranted in asking the House to support. I wish to confine our efforts at reforestation to the vast area in the railway belt which is of lesser value for agricultural purposes. The same policy will be applied to the three prairie provinces. Where the land is not suited for agricultural purposes it may be very well used for reforestation, but where it is suited for agriculture it seems to me that the greater value is achieved by employing it for purely agricultural purposes because, after all, there is plenty of land capable of producing timber and good timber that is not of great value for agricultural purposes. Under the regulations by which the coal lands of the west are administered at the present time, we do not contemplate the alienation of these areas except on condition that they shall be operated.

Mr. R. L. Borden—That is the present policy?

Mr. Oliver—Yes.

Mr. R. L. Borden—Within what time must they be operated?

Mr. Oliver—Within year from notice given by the government.

Mr. Ralph Smith—On lease.

Mr. Oliver—Yes; the lease is conditioned upon their being operated within a year from notice given by the government. That is the point I want to show—the difference between reservation and preservation, between reservation and development. We are not handing out—as I think my hon. friend suggested—the coal areas of the country to private hands; we are holding them in the hands of the government until the time arrives when they can be worked at a profit. And then our policy is that the opportunity shall be there to the first-comer, the first man who is prepared to take them over upon the terms upon which we offer them, which terms involve their operation.

Mr. Fowler—Have you increased the size of the area that may be given to one individual under the new system of leasing instead of selling?

Mr. Oliver—Our regulations do not provide for granting more than four sections to one individual, but they do provide that several individuals may combine their interests. When we have sold, we have only sold half-sections.

Mr. R. L. Borden—In the form of lease you adopt, is there a certain ground rental and a royalty.

Mr. Oliver—Yes. The ground rent is $1 an acre a year; the royalty is five cents a ton.

Mr. Foster—Can that be raised by the government?

Mr. Oliver—I think not.

Mr. Foster—Is there any system of computation as to acreage payment and royalty payment?

Mr. Oliver—A coal lease is available to the first comer who will accept it on the conditions. We place a ground rent upon the land so that there will be no inducement to any one to hold it unless he operates it, and the condition of operation is a condition of the lease, upon notice being given.

Mr. R. L. Borden—The period of 21 years does seem a very short term on which to invite the investment of a large amount of money in the development and operation of coal mines. The system under the Nova Scotia lease is for 20 years with provision for three renewals, so that the total term reaches 80 years, after which the government is not obliged to renew, although I suppose under ordinary conditions they would certainly do so. There are also two important provisionse in the Nova Scotia statute, section 46, chapter 18 of the revised statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900:

"Every lease shall contain a provision that the royalties may be increased, diminished or otherwise changed by the legislature."

And in respect to the renewals to which I referred, it contains this provision:

"In any such renewal the rent payable by such lessee may be increased under the authority of this chapter or of any such statute, subject to the provisions of the next following section."

It seems to me there was a provision in the statute or the lease that the royalty might be increased at the end of each 20 year period, although I cannot place my hand on it at the moment. It seems to me that some such system as that would be a good one to adopt in regard to coal lands in the west.

Mr. Oliver—When the present regulations were adopted I had in view the operation of coal lands in the prairie rather than in the mountains. The operation of coal mines where the seams are horizontal and regular and the distance below the surface is not great does not require such a large investment. I will confess that I had not in mind, to the degree that I should have had, the application of these regulations to the mountains where the seams are irregular and where the expense of installation of a mining plant is stupendously greater. However, as these are regulations and not statutes, it is a matter that can be very easily adjusted, and I may say that the very great demand that was being made for coal lands under the recent regulations seemed to me to have outrun the probability of development to such an extent that I did not think the interest of the country were going to suffer seriously under the new regulations until we had at any rate plenty of time to see them experimentally in operation and to see where the faults and failings lie. I do not presume to be able to foresee every condition and I am very grateful for the suggestions that have been made to me. They have struck me also in this way. The Canadian Pacific Railway have a very valuable coal mine in operation in the Banff park under conditions as to lease, and they have a lease for a term of 20 or 21 years. Everybody knows that they have made a large expenditure and are operating a very useful mine. They are intending to enlarge their operations and require the investment of a still larger capital, but in looking for further capital to increase their operations they bump into the restriction of a 21 year lease. They say to us: We would like to get the privilege of a renewal of this lease and unless we can get that privilege we cannot secure the larger investment that we desire to make, and that is desirable in order that the country should get the full benefit of the coal measures there. Thus the matter has been brought very pointedly to my attention, and I think in time we will be able to remedy the difficulty.

Mr. Fowler—Is there any distinction between the anthracite and the ordinary bituminous coal under the regulations?

Mr. Oliver—We have not made any under our present regulations. The former regulations made a difference, the anthracite was sold at $20 an acre, while the ordinary coal was sold at $10 an acre. I do not think it would be advisable to provide for changes in the royalty, at any rate during the term of the lease. I think it would be very proper to arrange that there should be a renewal of the lease, and that at that time the royalty might be changed, but I do not think it would be a proper inducement to capital to hold out the possibility of the royalty being changed during the term of the lease. It would be very much better if you ask people to invest their money in the enterprise, that you should let them know exactly what the ground rent and the royalty are, during a reasonable period, at any rate. If I were willing to concede any change, it would be in regard to the ground rent rather than the royalty. I may assume that the regulations, as far as they have come under criticism as yet, are reasonably satisfactory, and I shall certainly take account of the representations that have been made in regard to the extension of the term.

Mr. Galliher—Will the royalty be applied to all companies which are now operating mines?

Mr. Oliver—No.

Mr. Galliher—The government propose, however, to levy a royalty on all new mines?

Mr. Oliver—Yes.

Mr. Oliver—I think it will be found that the lease system is not so much against operation as against speculation. One of the most highly developed coal properties in the west has been developed under the lease system in the Banff park. This is the Anthracite coal property, now operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. True they would be better off if they had a longer lease, or if I could arrange so that they would have a longer lease; but the fact nevertheless remains that out of the five or six mountain mines now in operation, this one is under lease and has the most thoroughly equipped plant of them all.

Mr. Galliher—That was long before the present regulation.

Mr. Oliver—Yes, under regulations which applied to Banff park alone. Those regulations are to a great extent the basis of the regulations now applicable to the whole country.

Mr. Galliher—Is the lease the same as at present?

Mr. Oliver—Practically the same.

Mr. Galliher—As to time?

Mr. Oliver—Yes, it does not provide for a renewal, but I think the difficulty can be overcome in the case by legislation. If I should come down with a bill asking for an amendment, my hon. friends will understand that the question has been already before the House. There have been leases issued to the number of sixty-four since the 15th June, 1907, under the present regulations. Quite true, a good many were in order to add to property already held under sale; but, on the other hand, there are also a number of applications for leases, for operation as separate mines. True it is that the inducements which formerly existed to prospect for coal—that is to say the speculative inducement—does not exist today; and I am free to admit that that speculative inducement was a right and proper, and up to a certain time, necessary feature of our coal development. We could not, in all human probability, have reached the development we have attained today under the existing regulations. There had to be in the beginning the element of speculation, but it seemed to me that we have now reached a reasonable measure of development, and the spirit of speculation having absolutely run wild, it was thought the proper time to put the industry on a basis of development rather than of speculation.

I submit that, with the provision for an extension of the lease on the conditions being fulfilled, the present regulations are more favorable for actual operation than the former ones. The fact that a number of operating mines have taken out leaseholds under the regulations is fair evidence on that point. But to clinch the matter absolutely, the former regulations provided for the sale of the lands and coal area at $10 per acre, subject to a royalty of ten cents per ton. The present regulations provide for the sale of the land—if you like to call it so—at $21 per acre and a payment of royalty of 5 cents per ton. Now, if you calculate the amount of coal contained in an acre of ground and figure it at 5 cents a ton, you will find, in operation, the land that was purchased at $10 an acre has, in many cases, cost hundreds of dollars more than that which is leased.

Mr. Ralph Smith—But in one case they own it and in the other they do not.

Mr. Oliver—Precisely—in one case they do not have to operate it and in the other case they do. Consequently, the element of speculation was very pronounced under the former regulations—though, as I have said, these regulations were perfectly proper up to a certain point. That element of speculation was too strong to be allowed to continue in the present condition of the country and especially in view of the fact instanced by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) that there had been already alienated some of the best areas of coal-bearing lands in the grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and the homestead lands given to settlers before the imposition of the royalty. And the fact that we were selling coal lands on a royalty of 10 cents per ton alongside lands that carried no royalty kept out of operation the land that we were selling. We have reduced the royalty by half so that there is only five cents a ton between the coal mined under our regulations and coal mined free of royalty. Therefore, there is not the same bar to the operation of coal lands held under our law as there was under the system of purchase which prevailed before.

Mr. Herron—Has the minister come to a settlement with the companies in the Crow's Nest Pass that have applied for a rebate?

Mr. Oliver—The companies operating in the Crow's Nest Pass have applied for a rebate or remission of royalty, but, so far, we have not been able to give either, and they are required to pay the royalty according to the terms of their purchases.

BINDER TWINE

Canadian Perfect 550 ft.	$11.40
Canadian Medal 600 ft.	13.00
Barb Wire 2 or 4 pt.	4.25
Wire Nails - - - -	4.00

NORTHERN HARDWARE CO.
J. R. HARPER, Manager.

FOR JEWISH MASSACRE.

Participators Are Sentenced, One to Three Years, Others to Less Than a Year.

St. Petersburg, June 23—Sentences were handed down yesterday in the cases of the participators in the Jewish massacre of 1905 at Binlystok, when eleven Christians and 73 Jews were killed and 23 Christians and 80 Jews wounded. One of the prisoners was sentenced to three years' penal servitude, thirteen were condemned to from six months to a year's imprisonment, and fifteen were acquitted. Four of the condemned were found guilty of actual participation in the killing of the Jews and the others of pillage.

The witnesses for prosecution ascribed the origin of the excess to an attack by Jewish agitators on a church procession. The attorney representing the Jewish community of Bialystok introduced a mass of testimony to show that the explosion of a bomb in the church procession was really the work of the police and soldiers and that the police participated in the excesses. The prosecutor in closing his address emphasized the provocation to which the police and Christian inhabitants had been subjected by a series of murders of police officials, etc.

Novoe Vrema, commenting on the verdict, says that the real truth has not yet been ascertained. The newspaper justifies the lightness of the sentences, saying that the destruction of Jews cannot be called murder but the outcome of years of chronic distress which has brought to a white heat the passions of peaceful inhabitants against their supposed exploiters.

Electrical Storm in Ontario.

Toronto, June 23.—There was a brilliant electrical display last night in a storm which raged till midnight. A small fire broke out in the Kingston general hospital, caused by lightning. The spire of St. Mary's cathedral was struck, and telephone and telegraph poles knocked down.

Heart Strength

Heart Strength, or Heart Weakness, means Nerve Strength, or Nerve Weakness—nothing more. Positively, not one weak heart in a hundred is, in itself, actually diseased. It is almost always a hidden tiny little nerve that really is all at fault. This obscure nerve—the Cardiac, or Heart Nerve—simply needs, and must have, more power, more stability, more controlling, more governing strength. Without that the Heart must continue to fail, and the stomach and kidneys also have these same controlling nerves.

This clearly explains why, as a medicine, Dr. Shoop's Restorative has in the past done so much for weak and ailing Hearts. Dr. Shoop first sought the cause of all this painful, palpitating, suffocating heart distress. Dr. Shoop's Restorative—this popular prescription—is alone directed to these weak and wasting nerve centers. It builds; it strengthens; it offers real, genuine heart help.

If you would have strong Hearts, strong digestion, strengthen these nerves—reestablish them as needed, with

Dr. Shoop's Restorative
"ALL DEALERS"