

the representations which these agents make. I will not detain the House any longer. I desired to say a few words as the seconder of the resolution, and to express my wish, that the Government would reconsider their land policy. They have already reconsidered that policy once, and made important modifications. I think there is room for still further improvement, and I trust the discussion which has taken place this evening, will have the effect of leading to that improvement in the land policy, which we have all earnestly desired.

MR. BOULTBEE: I did not intend to take any part in this debate, but I desire not to let it close without referring to some remarks that fell from the latest speakers. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, says, that the tide of emigration flows into the United States, and the conviction that attains among people generally, is that the United States offer a better field for emigration than Canada. I dare say there is much truth in what he says, and I do not think he would say it unless he believed it. But it is worth while to enquire why it is that such a feeling should prevail—why it is that people should be led to believe that the United States affords a better field for settlers than our own fertile prairies; the hon gentleman gives no argument. He states no facts, but simply makes the assertion that such is the fact. Very likely it is. The hon. gentleman who spoke before him said, if we are going to be ruined we want to know it, and he no doubt expressed the feeling which pervades a large number of hon. gentlemen opposite. When utterances, of hon. gentleman, to this effect are republished in their papers, circulated throughout the length and breadth of the land, and hawked about by American emigration agents, is it wonderful that the conviction, which the last speaker dilated upon, gains ground. The settlers whom these statements effect are, to a great extent, illiterate and ignorant. They know these men are members of the Parliament of Canada, and they scarcely recognise whether they are supporters of the Government or opponents of it. But they attach great importance to the language that falls from these hon. gentlemen, and I say that there could not be anything more painful to the community, there

could not be anything that could be a source of greater regret to a man who takes an interest in Canada, than to hear the utterances of these gentlemen who profess to be interested in her fate, to prophesy ruin and decay unless the administration of affairs should be entrusted to them. They held the Administration for several years, but they did not administer the affairs of this country in a way satisfactory to the people, and they were turned out of office. It seems to me that it would be more patriotic of them on the present occasion, in this Parliament, in this Session, if you like, and in future Sessions, not to decry so much the position which Canada holds. I have alluded briefly to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who spoke before the last speaker. I was not in the House when the hon. member for Perth began his speech. I only heard his concluding remarks. He was giving the House, as I entered, a collection of statistics, showing the amount of land held by the great landowners in England, Scotland and Ireland. In the abstract these statistics were not particularly interesting. There was nothing in their abstract value to enlist the attention of the House. If they had any value it was for the purpose of showing that the system advocated by the Government would lead to similar large holdings of land in the North-West. I followed the hon. gentleman as carefully as I could in my memory, and I think he stated that something like 20,000 people in Great Britain and Ireland held 100,000 acres of land apiece; and I suppose the purpose of his argument was to show that the policy of the Government would lead to similar large holdings in the North-West. Making calculations without the aid of pencil or paper it seemed to me that if we got as large holdings as this in the North-West; if we got 20,000 people holding 100,000 acres of land apiece, even if we only received \$1 an acre for that land, it would amount to \$2,000,000,000. But we might deduct very largely from the hon. gentleman's figures. We may reduce his figures by twenty, and we shall still have a much larger sum than the Government requires to build the Pacific Railway, without increasing the taxation of this country. I apprehend that the hon. gentleman would be as delighted with that result, as I would be, or the