

Mr. CHARLTON. I might. People who obtain timber limits in Michigan pay for them like honest men, and obtain them in competition with other men, they will not get a paternal Government to give them a limit for \$250 which they can sell for \$100,000.

I now propose to refer briefly to ranche companies and to the policy of the Government in placing pasture lands under lease at one cent an acre, without competition, receiving at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum on 16 cents an acre for pasture lands; and the only limitation has been that no friend of the Government could receive more than 100,000 acres. These lands, as this return will show, have been leased far in advance of the requirements of stock owners. I find, by the return which was laid on the Table of the House a few days ago, which brings down the statistics in regard to the ranche companies to the 1st March, 1886, that the number of acres under lease was 2,452,610; acres having cattle on them, 1,592,290; acres without cattle 860,320; number of companies who have cattle on ranches, 38; number without cattle, 20; number of companies having more than 1,000 animals on ranche, 15; total revenue from grazing lands up to 1st March, 1886, \$66,255.50 for this enormous area of land; total number of cattle, horses and sheep on all these ranches, 63,714, or one horse, sheep, or cow or animal to each thirty-eight acres. Thirty-eight acres for one animal! Nothing could show more strikingly than this fact that these lands have been leased far in advance of the requirements of stock growers. It cost so little, only \$1 annually for a farm of 100 acres, or \$10 for a 1,000 acres. These leases have been granted to friends in advance of the requirements of the trade, in advance of the requirements of those who had stock to put on them. These men have acquired these 2,450,000 acres, this vast quantity of land, and they have only 63,714 head of cattle on them. The amount of the annual rental if paid, is \$24,526, amounting, as I said before, at one cent an acre, to the interest at 6 per cent. on 16 cents an acre. There is something wrong in this. So much land ought not to have been leased, land put under lease without competition, which, after the system has been in operation for four years, carries one head of cattle for thirty-eight acres. Who knows, if this land had been put up to competition and bids had been invited, that it might not have brought 10 cents an acre. The Government were bound, if they were governed by considerations of the public interest and not by the interest of their friends, to offer these lands to the competition of the public and to secure the highest price they could for them, instead of passing them round to their friends with no limitation whatever except that no good boy should receive more than 100,000 acres. And the policy with regard to coal lands has been equally reprehensible. I have here a summary of a return brought down to February, 1883, which shows that 449 applications have been made for coal leases, and the following members of Parliament had made applications: J. C. Patterson, M.P., four applications; C. C. Colby, M.P., seven applications; John Haggart, M.P., one application; A. Boulton, M.P., one application; Thos. Scott, M.P., three applications; Hon. T. N. Gibbs, M.P., one application; Hon. John Ogilvie, one application.

Mr. HAGGART. An application that I made? For what?

Mr. CHARLTON. A coal lease.

Mr. HAGGART. No, I did not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I found your name in the returns.

Mr. HAGGART. No, you did not.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will hunt it up. Hector Cameron, M.P., one application; J. G. Blanchet, M.P., one application; Dalton McCarthy, M.P., one application.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. J. C. Rykert, M.P., one application; R. Doull, M.P., one application; Robert Hay, M.P., one application; George Hilliard, M.P., one application; Sir A. T. Galt—he is not a member—two applications; Hon. John Norquay, two applications; Nicholas Flood Davin, one application; Edward Farrer, one application. Now, these are all friends of the Government, no competition was invited for these leases. These applications, if granted, were granted without competition and on certain fixed terms.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do you say they were granted?

Mr. CHARLTON. The policy of the Government with regard to the coal lands of the North-West was not one in the interest of the settler. It was not to the interest of the settler that a coal mining monopoly should be granted, and that the Government should second efforts to take the coal lands of the North-West and put them in a few hands who might monopolise the business of mining and compel the people to pay so much more for their fuel, which is so necessary in a cold climate like that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman say these were granted?

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not. I say they were applications.

Mr. BOWELL. How could they be monopolies?

Mr. CHARLTON. No return has been brought down in reference to coal leases subsequent to 1883, and what number of these applications were favorably acted upon I am unable to say, but I give the applications.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no application from me anyway.

Mr. McCARTHY. Nor from me.

Mr. CHARLTON. Coming to other parts of the Government policy, I refer to colonisation plan No. 1. That plan was adopted on 23rd December, 1881. It was adopted just upon the eve of a dissolution of this House. Whether it was adopted expressly for the purpose of attaching to the Government a large speculative interest, I am unable to say, but whatever might have been the intention of the Government, the result was to attach to the interest of the Government a very great and powerful speculative interest in land. The results, of course, of these investments in colonisation lands have not been as favorable as those who invested anticipated. This has been largely due, perhaps, to the fact that the Government granted these lands to speculators. Nothing perhaps has had a more unfavorable influence upon the settlement of the North-West than the fact that the Government acted upon applications for blocks of land which were to be given to speculators, if they conformed to the conditions, at half the price the settler had to pay for the land. The rush under this plan No. 1 was something phenomenal. The order was issued on the 23rd of December, 1881. I see by returns that on the 1st January, 1883, one year and eight days after that order had been issued, after the colonisation plan had been made, and the number of applications made during that time was 251, and they covered 2,295 townships of land. The members who applied for colonisation land in that brief period were as follows:—

Robert Hay, M.P.,	applied for	6½	Townships.
Robert Hay, M.P.,	do	2	do
Robert Hay and associates,	do	2	do
Robert Hay,	do	5	do
Col. Williams, M.P.,	do	6	do
Geo. A. Drew, M.P.,	do	4	do
U. H. Mackintosh, M.P., & associates	do	7	do
John White, M.P.,	do	4	do
Geo. Guillet, M.P.,	do	10	do
Geo. Guillet, M.P.,	do	3	do
O. F. Ferguson, M.P.,	do	3	do
Hugo Krantz, M.P.,	do	5	do