

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is wrong about that. The lease was opened for community grazing purposes to the government of Alberta. I was not just sure about the lease but my hon. friend confirms my statement in regard to it. It was in the hands of the Alberta government for some considerable time for the purpose of community grazing. Then Mr. Burns having purchased the Glengarry ranch made application for the unappropriated portions of the lease and received them under lease in that way.

Mr. COOTE: As I understand it from the department, Mr. Burns secured his lease by assignment from the old holders of the lease, the old Glengarry Ranch Company. But their lease had been cancelled; if it had not been the land could not have been offered for community grazing. When it was not desired for community pasture then the applicants living in the immediate vicinity should have been taken care of, and I am glad to say some of them were. About one-half of the land was divided up amongst these applicants.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): More than that.

Mr. COOTE: It seems to me the department rather exceeded their authority, in recognizing an assignment from the company that had previously held the lease. The lease had been cancelled, so what interest that company had to assign I have never been able to figure out. I think the proper policy for the department to have pursued would have been to take into consideration all the applications that were made by residents in that vicinity, because some of those people are so badly in need of pasture that even a quarter section of lease would be much appreciated.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What reductions have taken place in the number of the outside service? I notice there is some reduction in the amount of money asked for this year for staff salaries.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We had 260 last year and we have 246 this year under this item. That is a reduction of fourteen.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What positions were done away with, land inspectors or what?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Some in each class. It is very difficult for me to give my hon. friend details of the actual positions that are done away with. The Dominion

Lands service extends over the whole three prairie provinces and the British Columbia belt.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Were any land inspectors let out?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Four.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Lands contingencies, etcetera, \$175,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: I should like to ask the minister to modify the regulations a little in order to allow a certain type of settler to homestead the second time. There is a district between lake Winnipeg and lake Manitoba in Manitoba that was settled up some years ago by immigrants who were brought in from Scandinavia and central Europe. While the great majority of them got very good land, in some cases they got land that is not fit for agricultural purposes at all. This was all bush country and while there was wood on the land, these men were able to make a living by cutting and selling it every year. But now the wood is practically gone and it is impossible for them to make a living there. During last winter, after a crop failure in that district, many of them would have starved had it not been for relief that was granted to them by the municipalities and the provincial government. The reason I am asking for special consideration for these men is that they did not homestead in the regular way. Those of us who have homesteaded know and the minister knows that you go and select your land and take your chance. It is up to you. These immigrants could not talk English and the land was selected for them. The departmental officials took them around and said: This is your land; this is your quarter section, and so on. They were not allowed the privilege of selecting their own land. Probably they could not have made a better job under the circumstances, not knowing the country and not being able to speak English, but the point is that they are not in the same position as a man who goes out and selects his homestead. The land they got turned out afterwards to be totally unsuitable for agriculture. Incidentally, I may say that some of that land has been sold to soldier settlers in that district and that is one reason why I have been pressing as hard as I can for revaluation in that section. These settlers should be allowed to homestead again where it is known that the land they are on is absolutely unsuitable for agricultural purposes. The homestead inspectors in that part of the country know what quarter sections