

man has sneered at the land regulations introduced by this Government. I ask if, from his place in this House, he dare contrast the vacillating land regulations of the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, in 1874, with the land regulations improved upon and adopted by the present Administration. I have shown that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in his colonisation Bill, proposed to sow the seeds of disunion and trouble for the struggling settler in the North-West—that he not only set apart the territory for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but did this also for different colonisation railway companies, thus allowing Americans to come in and control the trade of the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, thus diverting that to the United States. Now, if the House will permit me, I wish to contrast the land regulations of the present Government with the land regulations of the former Government, and both with those of the United States, which have been so frequently eulogised by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Chariton), and other hon. gentlemen opposite. Under the regulations of the late Government, no homestead and pre-emption grants were allowed, no sale of lands for cash was permitted, except under the peculiar clause in the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell, in 1878, which allowed favored classes to come in and claim the land and pay cash for it; thus certain men who were making a living by traffic along the railways, and had very little money, were put into the hands of a lot of land grabbers and speculators. No one was allowed to have more than 340 acres; \$1 per acre, cash down, was demanded, and the balance was to be paid at whatever time and at whatever price the Government might fix; actual settlement was to begin within a year, on pain of forfeiture of all payments. The House is doubtless aware that there have been various changes made in the land regulations by the present Government, according as the progress and development of the country required them, as the reports of agents came in, and as the opinions of Ministers were ripened and matured by experience. Homesteads of 160 acres each may now be obtained, on all the even-numbered sections (not otherwise disposed of), upon the simple payment of \$10 of an office fee. In the mile belt, that is the land one mile in width on each side of the railway, the actual settler must begin residence within six months, and break up his homestead land at a certain number of acres. Outside of the mile belt the homesteader may begin occupation within six months, and live only six months per annum on his grant, cultivating it, of course. The homesteader may reside within a radius of two miles of his land for the three years succeeding his entry. This is a particularly liberal provision, as it enables the settler to board for two or three seasons, or half a dozen to club together and live in comfort while cultivating their land. A homesteader may purchase his grant outright, if he pleases, after he has lived on it a year and cultivated thirty acres. A pre-emption plot of 160 acres can be had at the same time as the homestead grant, at \$2.50 per acre, or, in some parts, for \$2 per acre. On payment of a fee of 50 cents, a settler may get a permit to cut 30 cords of wood, 1,800 lineal feet of logs, 2,000 cubic feet of rails, and 400 roof rails. Payments for lands may be in cash, scrip, or police or military bounty warrants. Now, having shown that the land policy of the present Government is infinitely superior to and more liberal than that of the preceding Government, I wish to refer to that which some hon. gentlemen laud as everything that is wise and just and progressive—the land policy of the United States. In Canada, the land regulation grants to every actual settler a free homestead, and a pre-emption adjoining. In the United States a homestead and pre-emption cannot adjoin, and cannot be held at the same time. In Canada, pre-emption is the right to purchase a lot adjoining a free grant,

when the homesteader is entitled to his free patent. In the United States, pre-emption means the right to purchase a homestead lot, after living on it and improving it for not less than twelve months. In Canada, a man can get two homesteads and pre-emptions. In the United States, only one can be obtained. In Canada, the condition of ownership is three years' settlement and cultivation. In the United States, the term is five years. In Canada, a youth of eighteen years of age has the right to a homestead and pre-emption. In the United States, he must be twenty-one years old. For young men, therefore, Canada is three years ahead of the United States. In the United States, no person who is owner of 320 acres in any State or Territory can obtain a homestead. In Canada, the only condition for securing homestead and pre-emption is, that the man shall actually reside on the land. He may own lands in other places, without that fact preventing him obtaining his free grant and pre-emption. Now, I submit to the House that comparison of the land system of Mr. Mackenzie's Government with the land system of the present Administration, and the existing system, as contrasted with that of the United States, shows that our regulations in Canada are far more liberal and progressive in all that contributes to promote the public welfare and the public interest. The hon. member for West Huron dealt at length with the Indian question. That question has been treated with force, ability, power and exhaustiveness by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard); I shall, therefore, not allude to it at any length, but would remind the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that he, as Minister of the Interior, must have realised that at some future period there would be trouble with the Indians in the North-West, even when he did not know that Riel was plotting, or that an incipient rebellion was threatening that country. In 1879, when a Bill was brought in to increase the Mounted Police force to 500 men, the hon. member for Bothwell said:

"He was strongly impressed with the idea that there was danger of difficulties with the aborigines at no very remote period. He believed the supply of buffalo would, at an early day, be exhausted, these buffalo being the principal means of support of the Indians; and unless something was done at an early day to induce them to engage in industrial pursuits, serious complications would arise, when their present means of subsistence failed."

"Sir John Macdonald said no doubt the danger the hon. gentleman mentioned must always be contemplated. The Government and Parliament must be prepared for an outbreak some time, when the Indians' means of subsistence failed or became scarce."

"Mr. Mills has no doubt, before the time of the present Parliament expired, serious troubles would be witnessed in the North-West."

That was in 1879. The hon. member for Bothwell was a little previous in his prophetic fears; but I ask the hon. member for West Huron how, in the face of the fact that millions of dollars have been expended, that intelligent instructors using every advantage that civilization could afford have been provided, he can assert that the Government have ill-treated the Indians. The hon. member for West Huron quoted from different books and reports. I observed that he dropped his voice at the dates, and very frequently I could not hear them. I do not now know what particular years he mentioned or what particular reports he quoted from; but as the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier has dealt with that question, with great ability and as his statements will go the country, I am willing to put his arguments against those of three or four gentlemen of the same calibre as the hon. member for West Huron. It may, however, in this connection be imagined that I am not doing justice to the ex-Minister of the Interior. I forgot that we then had a sanguinary Minister of Interior; I forgot that his policy was, that in order to assist the Indians and in order to promote peace and comfort in the North-West, the Indians should be furnished with Winchester rifles; and if we look at the Estimates under his regime we will find an appropriation for rifles to the Indians. I do not know whether he thought, with my hon. friends last night, that the only