

crowding in upon them; and, after they get their cattle there, they may find the settlers crowding in to such an extent that they are seriously inconvenienced in the work they have specially set for themselves. So that we have not locked up the land from settlement, but on the contrary have reserved for the settler, that being the first consideration, the right to go in there and settle. We have received already on account of these ranche lands, an amount which would not have been received at all, of which we would not have seen a dollar, of \$76,532.29. But that is not all. What is the result in another sense? As the result of this ranche business, as the result of encouraging people to come in here and bring their herds and raise cattle in the country, we are able to supply our Mounted Police and our Indians at a far lower price than we could have done otherwise. In connection with the North-West Mounted Police we have the cost of beef supplied during the last three years, \$95,540, and, under the contract we are just letting in the Indian Department to persons within the country and whose cattle are within the country, we would at their prices get the same supply for \$54,917.52, or about \$41,000 of a saving upon the three years' operations in connection with the beef supply of the North-West Mounted Police. Then I find that, with regard to the Indian supply, taking the supply of last year at the price we paid for it and taking that same quantity at the price for which we are now letting contracts as the result of this ranche business being carried on within the country, the saving to the country would be \$-0,500, or on these two items alone over \$120,000, which may fairly be added in the meantime to the amount we have received for the ranches themselves as showing what the advantage to the country has been. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that we should not have adopted the ranche principle? Does he pretend to say that we should not have encouraged the herding of cattle in our North-Western prairies, which are so well adapted for grazing purposes, so well adapted that they are attracting at this moment the attention of Americans who are bringing their cattle over from the other side? No, Sir; I venture to say that if we had not done this, if we had allowed this land to lie fallow, and made no effort to utilize it to the public advantage, while not interfering with the settlement of the country, the first person to attack us would have been the hon. gentleman opposite, who would have pointed out that we were recreant to our duty in not securing the revenue to the country from this land which a wise policy would have enabled us to realise. In the United States they do not adopt this plan. There, a ranchman and a number of his cow-boys take up homesteads near together, they get four, or five, or six thousand acres in a block in that way. They make that their headquarters, it is their own land; they get it under the ordinary homestead and pre-emption system that prevails in the United States, and then their cattle graze over the whole country without their paying to the Government a sixpence of rental of any kind whatever. It seems to me we have adopted a wiser principle in dealing with ranches. Then the hon. gentleman tells us that we are giving coal areas to people; but he did not name the people who had got the coal areas. He made the extraordinary statement that the result of our policy was to make fuel dearer to the people of the North-West. Why, the hon. gentleman has never been in the North-West, I believe? The hon. gentleman who seconds his motion has been there, and has made considerable profit out of the North-West. He is one of those land speculators, one of those men, who, at the moment when a system was adopted by which land was given at \$1 an acre with a payment of 10 cents down, rushed in and took some 60,000 acres of land which he holds now, and which makes him a millionaire, and makes him better able to carry his election the next time on the same principle on

which he has carried his elections in the past. But the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, I suppose, has never been in the North-West, and he did not know, therefore, much about the question of fuel. I believe I am right in saying that the result of opening up those coal areas under the policy adopted by the Government, has been to reduce the price of coal in Winnipeg from \$17 to \$7 a ton. Therefore, if it be true that we have given these coal areas, even if it be to friends, we have at least the satisfaction of knowing that we have made fuel cheaper to the settlers of the North-West, that we had, in fact, reduced the price by considerably more than one-half, because, as you go further west and get nearer the coal areas, you will find that the price now is, I have no hesitation in saying, at least one-third what it was before. Now, with regard to these coal areas, we have adopted precisely the same policy as that adopted by the United States; and I confess I was rather astonished when, in the one particular in which we have slavishly followed the American system, after the hon. gentleman has been parading the American system, has been calling upon us every Session, to take a leaf out of the book of our friends on the other side of the border, yet, when we have done it in this particular case, still the hon. gentleman is not pleased, still he thinks we should have adopted some other plan. He says we ought to offer these to public competition. Why, Sir, how could we offer them to public competition? Coal underlies the whole North-West, and you can hardly tell where it may not be found. The policy we adopted is, that where there is a coal area we fix the price, as they do in the United States under similar conditions, at \$10 an acre, or, if it be anthracite coal, such as is found in the mountains, where the price was formerly \$20 an acre, we have reduced it down to \$12.50, upon the representation of the Inspector of Mines, that the cost of mining was so great that it was better to reduce it to \$12.50 in order to ensure the development of the anthracite mines to be found in the mountains. Now, any one can go in and get a coal area if he knows where to select it. He comes to the Department and pays his \$10 an acre, and then he can go back and open the seam and supply the people with coal, and so ensure cheap fuel for the people of the North-West. Then again, with regard to this matter of grazing lands, the hon. gentleman has been dealing considerably with the question of members of Parliament being interested in this matter. If I may refer to a previous debate which took place last night—although I know it is not in order—a member of this House was attacked because he had ranches in Texas. But what is he to do? If he had taken a ranche in Canada and put his cattle upon it in exactly the same way, he would have been attacked just the same, because it would then have been said that he was a mere pensioner upon the Government and could not therefore give an independent vote. When he goes to Texas he is attacked because he has gone away from the country and established a ranche in a foreign country. Now, Sir, as to this question of competition; the hon. gentleman has referred to an alleged fact—although it is not a fact—that some of these timber limits were sold by their holders at enormous prices to outside people. Now, there is not one of these outside people who could not have applied for his timber limit and who could not have obtained it by ordinary competition, if there were two persons who wanted it. But, Sir, we are to be told that the fact that people outside will sometimes purchase from a man who gets possession of a limit, is an evidence that the man in the first instance has got it improperly? What shall we say, then, of a celebrated lumber company with which, if I mistake not, that gentleman from Simcoe has something to do? What are we to say of that company? It is quite true that the unfortunate people which put their money into it did not find that it was quite as valuable as they were led to