

ernment promised but 140 acres to the Selkirk settlers, which they were getting and 160 to the half-breeds. We could not be surprised at the half-breeds receiving a little more land than the whites, since they had Indian blood in their veins, and represented the aboriginal possessions of the territory. They were naturally dissatisfied at not being granted what the last Government promised them. Every new settler, and the discharged settlers, who had been paid for their services, were allowed 160 acres apiece. He thought the heads of the half-breed families would have been content with a share of the land allotted to the other members, but the by-law providing for this division had been pronounced inconsistent with the letter of the law. He argued that, considering the antecedent rights of those heads of families, and the liberal treatment of not only their children, but of strangers, by the Dominion Government, it would have been unjust as well as unwise to prolong their discontent by refusing them the claims which they made in all fairness and equity. He explained the nature of the hay privilege, and exposed the idea of the enormous value of the two mile strip and the other tracts proposed to be given the half-breeds. He maintained that on the ground of long possession, services to the settlement, and for other reasons, the half-breeds were entitled to all the bill would concede them. (Hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND said it was very unfortunate this land question had not been settled long since. From the first grant of 1,400,000 acres, it was proposed to allow the half-breeds and old white settlers, whom he (Mr. S.) more particularly represented, 140 acres apiece; but since the Manitoba Act on this subject was passed, the grants had been so manipulated as to give the half-breed children 190 to 195 acres each, while the new Bill was to hand over 160 acres to each head of a family. He differed with his honorable colleague (Mr. Girard) as to the old whites being not entitled to as much land as the half-breeds. It appeared the whites must be satisfied, and do without more at present, but seeing it was proposed at first to put them on the same footing, he did not think the Selkirk Colonists would be content with the discrimination against them which this Bill would create. The honorable gentleman explained that owing to the narrow frontage of many of the old settlers' farms, on the river, even when they received the two mile strip in question, they would not have more than 70 acres apiece

It would be very great injustice to take away from those settlers the river lands, without which they could not subsist, the remainder being inadequate to their support. He would not offer any resistance to the Bill, because it proposed to settle the land question, the want of a settlement of which had produced much agitation. But he earnestly urged the Government and the House to place the old white settlers on an equal footing with the half-breeds, assuring members that with ever this concession, those colonists would not have any land for speculation or other than necessary purposes.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT quite agreed with the hon. gentleman who had preceded him that it was very much to be regretted the whole subject was not dealt with in a more liberal spirit in the beginning, as it would have saved a great deal of heart-burning, trouble, and expense. The discrepancy between the amount of land expected and received by the half-breeds, arose entirely from an error on the part of an officer of the branch of the service in charge of this interest. It was supposed that the 1,400,000 acres was intended to give 160 acres.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS dissented from the statement.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT gave Col. Dennis as his authority. The hon. gentleman pointed out the difficulty of withdrawing lands granted the half-breed children, in order to a fresh division for the benefit of the parents also. Confirming the grant to the children, which they had under the old act to do, allowed them 190 acres each instead of the 160 originally intended, and pointed out the error of the bill of last session granting but 160 acres, and of the under estimate of the Selkirk settlers. He stated that were he approaching the matter for the first time, he would be prepared to give twice or thrice 140 acres to the men who had gone out to the North West so many years ago, planted the British flag there and endured all hardships in the founding of the present settlements and introduction of civilization. It was assumed the Selkirk settlers would have been satisfied with what they got; doubtless they were entitled to more, but as remarked by an hon. gentleman, land was cheap in that country, and free grants could be had in abundance by *bona fide* settlers. He proposed to amend the bill in Committee by striking out the third and fourth clauses and introducing a general clause; providing that all persons satisfactorily establishing an undisturbed occupancy of any lands within the Province of Manitoba, prior to, and in actual