

Manitoba, or our own North-West. That must be the natural conclusion to be drawn from his remarks, because he made the general statement that Dakota and Minnesota were more prosperous than the Canadian North-West, and that their land laws were more liberal. Let any American newspaper man or railway man take the speech of the hon. gentleman, and he could obtain half a dozen emigrants with it. Now, what is the condition of the people of Dakota, as compared with the condition of our own people? Take the matter of taxation. Mr. Webster states in his pamphlet, among other things, at page 14:

"And I further affirm that there is no emigration from Manitoba to Dakota, for the above and other reasons; and, further, the near future of Dakota, financially, is not of the kind to inspire confidence in the mind of a thoughtful immigrant farmer. On the 1st of June, 1887, the farm mortgage debt of Dakota was \$45,000,000. That sum, if equally divided, would be a mortgage of \$400 on every family in Dakota. But all are not farmers; so much the worse for those that are. At the same date the average six mortgages on six sections of 160 acres was \$800, drawing an interest of 10 per cent. Add to this the county debts, averaging \$30,000, and the thoughtful farmer can see why taxes are high, and why it is hard to make wheat growing profitable in Dakota."

He says with regard to Manitoba:

"I know of no country in which municipal taxes are as low as in Manitoba. Nature made the roads, leaving only the bridges for the municipalities to build."

In this connection, I may say that our municipal taxes in Manitoba in the last few years have been very much reduced, and there are several municipalities in the county of Brandon that have balances in the bank. The city of Brandon, on the 1st of January, after providing for the interest on its coupons and for every other demand, had \$3,500 to its credit in the bank; the municipality of Elton had \$4,000; and the municipality of Cornwallis had \$1,500. The municipality of Oak Lake and the municipality of Blanchard, in the county of Marquette, had also large balances in the bank. If the municipalities are prosperous, I think that is good evidence that the people must be prosperous. Now, I say in answer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that our land laws are far more liberal than those prevailing in Dakota and the western States; and it does not behoove him, or any other member of this House, to make the general statement he has made. Our land laws have not been all that we could have wished them to be; but if any hon. gentleman imagines that the land laws of the United States are perfect, all he has to do is to go to the library to find volume after volume of the decisions of the land officers at Washington, and to find that they have had more trouble with their land laws than we have had. There are certain matters that we would like to have changed, but we are glad to have as Minister of the Interior a gentleman who has spent eight or ten years of his life in the North-West, and is conversant with our wants and requirements; and as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) said this afternoon, from the interview that we had with the hon. Minister to-day, we are satisfied that he is desirous of giving the settlers of that country all that is required to make the land laws of this Parliament satisfactory to them. I do not wish to state anything of what occurred at that interview; but as the representative of one of the constituencies of Manitoba, I am well satisfied with what the hon. Minister promised. When the new land regulations are laid before the House, we shall have a full discussion of the question, and I will reserve any further remarks I have to make until that occasion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad indeed to hear the glowing accounts given by the hon. gentleman of the prosperity of the North-West. I am sure it is a matter of great satisfaction to us all to learn that the prospects of the country are so bright. We shall indeed be pleased to see a large influx of population into that country. I also listened with great interest to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He put

Mr. DALY.

the case of the settlers in very plain and pointed terms, and endeavored to show what changes were, in his opinion, necessary in the land regulations. I think it will not be denied that things occurred in that country which we have to regret, and that mistakes have been made in connection with the land regulations. It was a very unfortunate arrangement by which the Government permitted large sections of that country to be taken up by colonisation companies and withheld from actual settlers for years, so that many persons who went in there were prevented from settling where they wanted to. If the arrangements had been such that the actual settler could have gone in and taken up land wherever he wished to locate, I believe a larger population would be there than there is at present. These are matters that we have to deplore, and I earnestly hope, along with the gentlemen who have spoken, that the Minister now in charge of that department will make such changes as will give the actual settler greater advantages than he has enjoyed in that country hitherto. But while we are prepared to lend our hearty encouragement to every movement that will tend to fill that country with population and promote its development, that would tend to bring it up to the standard where I would like to see it, a great populous and wealthy country. There is another side of the question that has not been touched by any hon. gentleman opposite, the question of expense. I hold that in their arrangements the Government have expended enormous sums of money for the purpose of meeting the wishes of political friends and finding soft and easy resting places for those who were pressing upon them for lucrative positions. When we come to consider the condition of things as we find them by the Auditor General's Report, we have to deplore the fact that an enormous amount of money has been expended compared with the amount received in return. I find that we expended altogether last year, including the expenses of the Winnipeg board, and the expenses west of Winnipeg, as follows: Dominion lands, outside service, \$149,536.61. We expended on the Half breed Commission \$6,714.39, and we expended on the registrars, of whom we have seven, \$13,386.32. Now this is in all an expenditure for officials in the North-West, including the Land Board at Winnipeg, and all west of that, of \$169,637.32. Now, what were our receipts? Our entire income last year from the sales of lands, mainly coal lands, ranching grants, and all other sources was \$267,973.51, leaving a balance to our credit of \$98,336.18. That virtually means that for all the money received in the North-West, we have actually paid out 60 per cent. for hired service, agents, inspectors, travellers, and the like. I want to give a resume of the account, as it now stands, for the last year. As I stated before, we have expended \$149,534.61 under the head of Dominion lands account. That includes contingencies. Then we have expended in the Department of the Interior, inside service, salaries here at Ottawa, \$35,011.43; on surveys, \$136,009.02; salaries at Ottawa, Dominion lands, \$76,604.67; contingencies at Ottawa belonging to Department of Interior, \$22,137.02. In all we have expended in the Department of Interior, including the expenses in Ottawa, and the expenses in the North-West, and the surveys, \$420,744.76. Now, let us look at the receipts. We have received from Dominion lands and ranching leases, &c., \$217,688.01; from ordnance lands, \$36,239.88; from the registry office, \$7,212.02; fines and forfeitures, \$7,065.76; and other fines \$372.79; in all we have collected \$267,973.50. Deducting that from our expenditure, we are actually at a positive loss in the operation of the Department, including the surveys for last year, of \$166,172.22, but allowing that the surveys performed last year, which cost \$106,000, should be charged to capital account, we are actually at a loss of \$60,172.22, on last year's operations. Now, to give the House a little idea of the manner in which this condition of things is brought