

plan that has been suggested in a report made to Congress by a United States Commissioner. I may mention that I made enquiry at the Land Grant Department at Washington, and was informed that the suggestion of the Commissioner did not become law for want of time, but the head of the department reports that he has no doubt that at the next Session of Congress it will become law.

Mr. MILLS. There are cases where parties going to the North-West Territories and Manitoba have taken up sections, but finding scarcely any water there they have built a mile or two away, near some brook or spring, but have made improvements on their sections. There was a difficulty about their right being recognized. While they are carrying on improvements their actual residence is somewhere else. I never saw any objection myself to allowing these persons to retain their homesteads and to recognize them, although they may not be actually residing on the lands.

On clause 7, section C, providing for variation of requirements in the case of settlers forming villages,

Mr. BLAKE. Why is this applied to homestead settlers other than immigrants? I understand that it is the custom among some of the Mennonites to live together in villages or hamlets, and if it is good for our own people to settle in that way, why not for the people of the old world?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because we cannot foresee exactly the applications which foreign immigrants may make and the nature of their requirements. They would ask for special privileges connected with their special requirements and customs.

On clause 8, containing special provision as to leases of grazing lands,

Mr. BLAKE. I do not observe that there is any special provision for selling lands in the grazing district. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to use these powers with respect to sales.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that a Government lease of grazing lands, no matter for how many years, if terminable only on two years notice, is quite as safe an instrument for the lessee as anything he could have. But that to my mind is a reason why we should alienate as little of that territory in fee simple as we can. If a man puts up buildings and makes other improvements on the land, and wants to own it, it is reasonable that he should. I do not see that so much land as my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Wiser) mentions is necessary for grazing purposes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Cochrane, who has gone to England to make arrangements for bringing out a certain kind of cattle to mingle with the herds which he can get on this side of the Atlantic, asked for 10,000 acres, and said he would start with 10,000 head of cattle and run up to 300,000. I thought that 10,000 acres in fee simple was too much, and that we should not give more than 5,000 acres. We spoke of \$2 an acre as the price; but that is a matter we cannot decide upon until we get a report on the country, and ascertain what the size of the homestead—the cattle sheds, stables, and so forth—will be. If we sell 5,000 acres at a good price to a large ranchero, I do not think the country will be a loser.

Mr. BLAKE. Did Mr. Cochrane mention his own opinion as to the quantity of land required for his herd.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 100,000 acres; and he expected a large increase to his herd.

Mr. JONES. Is there any protection for men with small ranches who settle on these lands?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although settlers of that description have no legal rights in the land, and although

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

it is not well to encourage people to scatter over that immense continent on unsurveyed lands, still when people do settle down and make improvements, they have always been respected in Ontario and Quebec, and will, I have no doubt, be respected there.

On clause 10, providing for charging expenses of passage, etc., on lands of immigrants,

Mr. BLAKE. This may be open to a great deal of abuse unless the hon. Minister of the Interior sees that the whole claim, for whatever purpose, represents expenses actually incurred. I see not why the hon. Minister should take power to verify a portion of the expenses and not the remainder.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said, with reference to section A, clause 10, that it was for the purpose of keeping down, as much as possible, the cost of subsistence. That should be scanned carefully to prevent abuse by agents. It would not be possible to check effectually the cost of erecting buildings, providing farm implements and seed grain; but the charges for subsistence could be checked.

Mr. BLAKE. The agents will be careful not to exercise fraud or imposition in the charges for subsistence and passage money, as these will be scanned by the Government officer, but they will do so in charges for erecting houses, &c., which will not be scanned. The right hon. gentleman, of course, anticipates imposition or there would be no necessity for the clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The argument of the hon. gentleman would be in the direction of striking out clause A. When the immigrant gets on his location, he will consult his neighbors as to how much they paid for their houses, implements, etc., and will thus be able to check the charges himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that \$600 be made the outside figure in clause C for principal and moneys advanced against a homestead.

Mr. ANGLIN. \$400 was the amount named by the hon. Minister of Agriculture as sufficient for a family of five persons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sir A. T. Galt, who has been in communication with some of the capitalists and benevolent societies, suggested \$500. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture suggested \$600. Perhaps \$500 would be the better amount.

Mr. BLAKE. We have the authority of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture that \$400 would suffice.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I made no allowance for farming implements and subsistence, and besides men who gave \$100 as the amount sufficient to erect a house, would not take a contract to do so at that rate.

Mr. ANGLIN. There will be this difficulty in carrying out the arrangement, that the men who go out there will find themselves starting with a burden of debt to which other settlers are not liable. It will be an obligation on the land, to get rid of which will be a strong temptation to them to cross the border, especially as many of them will have their minds previously excited by the glowing prospects exaggerated by agents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will not care to leave a place where they have comfortable quarters erected for them to go over to the States where they must begin *de novo*, and where their personal responsibility would equally follow them.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me it will invite fraud. If the hon. gentleman considers the subject, he might, with an active, careful, energetic man, who would consider the whole account or claim of the party against the emigrant, prevent fraud upon the emigrant. But what it is proposed