

limit the time within which it will be competent for parties who propose to accept the gift of the Government to the 1st of August 1886. I can quite understand that those who desire to settle in the country may be entirely precluded from making selections in the short time given. This year is practically gone. They are returning now, and their avocation in the eastern portion of the Dominion will preclude their going there this year again. The time is too short, and I think it is a mistake on the part of the Government. Our ancestors understood this much better. My hon. friend knows very well that when the U. E. Loyalists came to this country and got their grants of land they were not restricted as to time. They and their children had time to make selections. The result of the limitation proposed in this bill is that very considerable numbers of the volunteers will be induced to take scrip and dispose of it, and the country will be deluged with scrip and of course it will run very much below its face value when there is a great deal of it in the market, and our bounty will be restricted very considerably. Eighty dollars of scrip will be equivalent to \$40 cash. I have long felt that this issuing of scrip is subject to great abuse. When I was in office I endeavored to make the scrip, which was issued to the half-breeds, non-transferrable and it should only be of value in the hands of the person to whom it is issued, and the land should be taken up only in his name. It is always desirable in cases of this kind to protect people from their own weaknesses. I will not go over this scrip question. I have been familiar with it half a century. We issued scrip after the rebellion of 1837-38, and my hon. friend will recollect when that scrip was issued how it depreciated in value and the people for whom it was intended really got no advantage from it. I think we are making a mistake now, and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the desirability of legislating so that this will be really a valuable gift to the volunteers. There is no necessity for all this scrip coming back immediately. Why not allow the volunteers a longer time to select and take up lands? We are giving them a substantial area of property. If they do not take it take it up within the time specified we give them scrip for only \$80. That \$80

will represent, in the hands of a needy person who does not feel inclined to take the land, from \$30 to \$50. I have known that amount of scrip to be sold for one-tenth of its face value. In fact it is well known that when scrip was issued in the North West it was bought for five or ten dollars, and sometimes even for a bottle of whiskey. In that way the policy of the Government is defeated. It is a question which I take a great interest in, having myself been familiar with its working and having watched its operation. I do feel that it is important to protect people against their own weaknesses. Our object is to give each volunteer a section of land in that country. If they sell it afterwards we cannot help it, but I think it is most desirable that they should really get the patents for their lands. We can say that whether the volunteers part with their scrip or not, the patents shall be issued in the names of the parties entitled to the scrip, just as the patents were issued in the name of the U. E. Loyalists, although some of them had parted with their rights. When a patent was issued it was known that it was the right of Brown, Macdonald, or whatever the name happened to be, and there was no limitation as to time; they were not cut off by being forced to take scrip, and I think my hon. friend would render a most important service to the volunteers if he would call the attention of the Government to this point. I have no doubt that the mistake has been made most inadvertently, at the suggestion of some clerk in the department, that the grant ought to be converted into scrip and taken up at once. We have millions and millions of acres in the North-West, and why should we say to these people you must take up this land before August of next year? It seems an unreasonable thing that a man having a right to land, cannot say, "I will not take it up now, but I have a boy growing up, and he can take it up after he is educated." I say we ought to give the right to take up that land for at least a period of five years, and I have no doubt if attention is called to it at the end of five years, and it should be found necessary to renew the grant, Parliament would readily do so. In adopting that course we should really be conferring substantial benefit upon the country. Otherwise you will find that