

settler 160 acres and the right of pre-emption to another 160? To my mind it is. It may be said that the homesteader who has lived upon his homestead sufficiently long to secure his patent may sell out to a new comer who would prefer paying some money for land, a portion of which has been brought under cultivation, than to go on to a new section altogether. That might be the case in a few instances where settlers live adjacent to each other and one wants to buy out the other. All he has to do is to purchase the right of the first homesteader, and that homesteader goes into another section of the country and has the right to homestead again for another 160 acres. That is limited to the semi-arid region.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It does not make any difference whether it is limited or not. I am speaking generally. It seems to me that if a man goes into that country and homesteads and gets 160 acres for nothing, he ought to be satisfied and the government ought not to extend the right to give to that same man another 160 acres for nothing because he goes in and settles upon it. It does not seem to be the view of the former government, and this government had for a long time in adopting the free grant system. There may be speculative men who take a different view of this question. The country is liberal enough when it offers a homestead of 160 acres to any actual settler. That is sufficient for him to make a comfortable living for himself and family. If he wants more land, he should pay for it. I am quite in favour of the system of homesteading, but this Bill extends it altogether beyond the limits of generosity.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS—The hon. gentleman from Hastings is probably not aware that, generally speaking, one hundred acres in the west is not enough for farming. At one time, when there was a large amount of railway lands available, one could homestead 160 acres and buy another quarter section, but that is not the case now. If this area is thrown open to homestead entry, the homesteader has no pre-emption, and every one who knows the conditions in the west will bear me out in saying that it is absolutely necessary to have a larger area than a quarter section.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Could not the homesteader pre-empt the adjoining 160 acres?

Hon. Mr. DAVIS—He could, if there was any to pre-empt; but it is not easy to get an adjoining quarter section. With reference to a person selling his homestead and locating another, it does not make much difference to the country if he does. What we want is to get the land settled. If a new settler prefers to buy out a homesteader in order to get a farm in a settled section, with improvements, and the pioneer is willing to sell and take up another homestead, I do not see how the country is injured. I would rather give him another homestead than see him move out of the country.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On subclause 8 of clause 11,

8. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, every person who has received or receives, or has become or becomes entitled to letters patent for a homestead by the performance of homestead duties, with or without payment of purchase money, or by the location of scrip thereon, shall be deemed to have exhausted his homestead right and shall not be entitled to obtain another entry for a free homestead: provided, however, that any person who, on the second day of June, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, had obtained or had become entitled to letters patent for a homestead, shall be permitted to make a second entry for a homestead.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS—Scrip is issued to a half-breed for the purpose of extinguishing the Indian claim; but the half-breed is just as much entitled to enter a homestead as any other man. Does it mean that a half-breed shall not be entitled to a homestead after he receives scrip?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—He could not have a right to land as well as scrip. He is given scrip to apply on the land if he chooses; but if he does not do so, he is not entitled to a double entry.

The clause was adopted.

Hon. Mr. COFFEY, from the committee, reported that they had made some progress with the Bill, and asked leave to sit again.

The Senate adjourned until 8 p.m.