

including the great commercial state New York, and the great agricultural state, Ohio, the increase was only 11·14 per cent., or nearly 1½ per cent. less than in Canada. I think these facts show that, having regard to the relative positions of the two countries, we have nothing to be ashamed of in the increase which took place during that period. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the large emigration from the older Provinces to our western territories is of no advantage to us. I do not agree with them. If these men leave the older Provinces, it is because they are becoming too straightened in their circumstances where they are, and if they did not go into our territory they would go to the United States. Let us look for a moment at the land policies of the two countries. In the United States, under their land grant policy, the price of land within the railway belts is \$2.50 an acre. Outside their railway belts the price is \$1.25; but outside the railway belts in Canada, and for a large portion of the territory, the price is \$1 per acre, so that the price here is actually less than in the United States. In the United States the price is cash, in Canada it is time. The settler can get his homestead lot of 160 acres and take his preemption lot alongside of it, and have it for three years to enable him to break up the ground and prepare it for settlement; and then, by paying four-tenths down at the end of the three years, he has six years more in which to pay the balance, while in the United States he would have to pay cash for the whole at the start. It seems to me that, under these circumstances, it cannot be said, with truth, that the policy of this country is not at least as favourable as the policy of the United States, in respect to the settlement of our unoccupied territories. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin),<sup>a</sup> made a statement which I know is frequently made; he pointed out that the enormous interest account was still going on, and could not be made up by the sale of lands. Well, suppose we admit that; what does the hon. gentleman propose to do? Does he propose to take the course of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and give the lands away, in order that we may be more fully recouped in paying the interest upon the expenditure? Or, is he prepared to stop

the expenditure, and thus prevent the realisation of the hopes we have of the future of that country? If the latter course, then we shall lose, practically, all the money that has been spent, for we are at this moment spending money, the results of which we are to see hereafter. We are at the most critical period of our national existence—if I may use that expression—precisely at the time when large expenditures have to be made, looking to the realisation of profits in a future more or less distant. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to stop all this expenditure, and say, that we had better give the land for nothing, or practically for nothing, because we have no immediate return for the expenditure made in developing it? I doubt much whether the hon. gentleman fairly considered where his argument really leads him. But after all, what is the gravamen of the charge against this policy? After all we have heard of the enormous price that is asked for lands, the charge is that they are going to be given away too cheaply; and while on the one hand, the hon. member for Perth has stated the highest price for the most favourable lands, as the general price of lands which will deter emigrants from going there, on the other hand, we have the hon. member for North Norfolk, stating the lowest price for the most inferior lands, as an argument on which to base his resolution against speculators, to entrap votes in this House. I hope he will not be successful, and I, therefore, beg to move the following amendment to the said proposed amendment:

“That all the words after ‘That’ be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: ‘the policy of the Government for the disposal of the public lands in Manitoba and the North-West, is well calculated to promote the rapid settlement of that region, and to raise the moneys required for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, without further burthening the people, and that it deserves the support and approval of this House.’”

MR. SCRIVER: I do not propose at this late hour to detain the House by any lengthened remarks. However, at the risk of being considered unpatriotic by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, I desire to say a few words. If there are any evils with regard to the land system of the North-West, we ought certainly to be prepared to examine into that system fully, and discover where such evils exist.