

them—it is a
of them even
nd. I doubt
sease from
ere to present
ers of Man-
Parliament.
ard. (Hear,
of Brandon,
om I happen
ful farmers,
sly political
and I would
us Mr. Sifton,
and others of
is delegation.
ey were sen-
have nothing
political clap-
o in the *Globe*
This was the
were prepared,
country, to
nment.

SETTLERS.

a buckboard.
a farmer on his
ghbour, where
l, I came from
as as the case
number from
and that every
t a single ex-
and went there
e, and a livli-
onest industry
atisfied, and as
Ontario. I did
I find them?
s and read-
and I will
er cent. of the
en. (Cheers.)
om Grey (Mr.
ve an instance
ers of the hon.
rment, going
ading where to
find a spot in
there are more
occupied lands,
ne of that pro-
out of supporting
out involving
ve have in On-
ts of my hon-
ries, could not

find where to lay their heads in. (Hear, hear.) I came across one or two men who said they had always been conservatives and voted with the conservative party, that went up to that country and were dissatisfied; on inquiry, I found that they expected something from the officers of the department, contrary to the expressed statute, and did not get it. (Hear, hear.) The law was administered so fairly and properly in the interest of the actual settler that these men had to come back without succeeding in their object. Many of these men were unsuccessful business men—unsuccessful newspaper men—or, perhaps, there was some chap who had been unsuccessful in running an election, and who thought that if he went up there and selected a valuable property, he could get it in some way by bulldozing the government, and immediately realize a handsome sum and return home in a few months pecuniarily happy. These were the kind of men who said they were Tories, and who growled. (Cheers.) These were the only class of men whom I found there growling.

THE LAND REGULATIONS.

I asked: "Well, what is the matter?" "Oh, it is the land regulations." "Well, what do you object to in them?" "Oh," they say, "it is the land regulations." Now as to the land regulations, their advantages were explained so fairly and so fully the other night by the hon. member for Lisgar, that it is unnecessary for me to make any long reference to them. But I feel that our land regulations are so liberal, so generous, and so inviting, compared with those prevailing in Dakota and other western states, that I cannot refrain from mentioning a few of their features. Hon. gentlemen know that one of the first things that meets a Canadian or any other man who goes to settle in Dakota or Minnesota, is the oath of allegiance, especially against Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) Do we impose any such conditions upon any one who goes to our Northwest? No, we say; you give us your citizenship for three years, and we will give you our land; the American term of residence is five years. They exact continuous residence, with us only six months in each year of the three years is required, a special advantage to young men without means. And with reference to pre-emptions, no settler in Dakota can get a pre-emption until he gets a certificate of his homestead, that is, has fulfilled his full year's occupancy and performed the statutory improvements. The result is,

that he is then often obliged to locate his pre-emption 30 or 40 miles away from his homestead, thus separating his family by long distances a great source of inconvenience which need not occur under our system. (Cheers.) In our Northwest, the moment a man makes his homestead entry, he can make his pre-emption entry, and he gets the two side by side; and he receives all the advantages that can accrue to him from his entering for that pre-emption, by the fact of his occupation of his homestead. It is just as sure to him as his homestead, provided he fulfils the necessary requirements of his homestead. So that there is no comparison between Dakota and our Northwest in that respect. And yet hon. gentlemen get up in this House and state that one of the causes of the exodus, which I could not discover, is the inferiority of our land regulation to those of the United States. Now

WITH REGARD TO THE EXODUS.

I found a great number of men in Manitoba from Dakota, from Minnesota, and in the far west from Montana. I met one very intelligent man at Medicine Hat who had been a mixed grazer and farmer in Montana, and he said to me, "As compared with Montana this is God's country." (Cheers.) That was his expression. Now, I have heard it said that there are large settlements of Canadians in the United States, and hon. gentlemen opposite attribute those settlements to the difference in the land laws of the two countries. I say that is absurd and unfair. I know that there are large settlements of Canadians in the western states—whole districts for miles around; but they went there before the present land laws were in force; I am speaking more particularly of Michigan and Illinois, in which there are large numbers of people from my own neighbourhood. Men whom I have lived with for many years have gone out there. And why did they go? For this simple reason: they were led away by the profuse and attractive advertising not only of the American government, but principally of American railway companies that had prairie lands for sale. I remember twenty years ago seeing something that I thought should not have been tolerated by the Canadian people—the immense placards which were hung up at every prominent point in the country. I remember seeing in the Union station at Toronto, and also at Montreal, immense glass cases, about six feet long, containing specimens of all sorts of grain and soil from Illinois, Minnesota and other western