

the whole terms and conditions under which the House supposed it was dealing with the question of grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway itself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway we provided for in this Act. I think the House and Parliament might be inclined to trust the Government with the power that is absolutely necessary in order to attract emigration to the North-West on a large and systematic scale. To attract this European emigration you must give people with money inducements to assist in the work. The majority of the emigrants would not be able, perhaps, to pay their own way to that region, or only with difficulty, and, in order to enable them to come out, there must be some such confidence and trust in the Government as will enable it to make arrangements with persons who might advance the passage money to those people to help them out to settle in the North-West. There is no other way of doing it but by giving the Government some such power. It has been thought advisable that the power of leasing lands should be reserved to a certain extent with regard to mill sites, grazing lands, and some other lands, which it might not be advisable to sell at first. I quite agree that this provision as a general rule would not be a wholesome one. No Government would willingly introduce a system of leasing rather than a system of sale. I think that any and every Government, however, could be safely trusted on this point.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will observe that the second sub-section of clause thirty deals with this subject of water powers, mill sites and stone quarries, which may be disposed of on such terms and conditions as may be fixed by the Governor in Council. If it is decided that these are to be leased, let them be leased, and let there be a general power to lease them. We find, however, that whenever the First Minister comes to explain any of the clauses of the Bill, there appears something behind that does not apply to the main subject of the clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, in order to meet the views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) I will agree to strike out of clause thirty, the words "or lease" as applied to the disposal by the Government of Dominion lands, which can be therefore always sold if desired.

Mr. MILLS. Without such an amendment it might be said the Government of Canada desired to introduce such a state of things as prevails in Ireland, leasing to the poor and selling to the rich.

Mr. BLAKE. When we get down to the provision in clause thirty:

"Provided also that except in special cases where otherwise ordered by the Governor in Council, no such purchase of more than a section, or 640 acres, shall be made by the same person: Provided further that where deemed expedient by the Governor in Council such purchase shall be restricted to the odd-numbered sections in each township."

That indicates that unless the Governor in Council takes special action, the rule is, that the purchaser shall not be restricted to the actual number—that it requires special provision to restrict to the odd number. Why is that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For the purpose of giving the Governor in Council power to restrict to the odd number sections the right of purchase. There is nothing in this present Act reserving the even number. It is considered that most likely the Government will have a policy subject to the approval of Parliament, to provide that the even numbered sections should be held for homestead purposes, and that if the Governor in Council should declare that purchasers shall be restricted to the odd numbers that they shall be so restricted.

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be better to alter the phraseology, so as to declare that unless the Governor in Council should order to the contrary, the purchasers

should be restricted to the odd numbered sections in each township?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It comes to the same thing.

Mr. BLAKE. No. You are laying down a policy that it is expedient to make those restrictions, unless the Governor in Council should see it expedient to depart from that rule.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. As to the general matter, I desire to enter my protest individually against this system, because I am perfectly convinced that these attempts to bring in large bodies of people, in the fashion presented, will end as such attempts have ended before, in far fewer being brought out than the Government imagine, and in large tracts of land falling into the hands of individual purchasers. Prince Edward Island is a case in point. The island was divided into twenty or thirty blocks about the size of three in the North-West Territory. Stringent conditions were imposed upon those who got the grants; they were to bring out a considerable number of associates and to incur a considerable expenditure; they were, if I remember aright, to make some roads and erect some buildings. But we all know that the conditions were not fulfilled, that only some few people were brought out, and that the land lapsed into the hands of proprietors whose proprietary rights were subsequently commuted after interminable delay and trouble. The same thing will occur in this case. We will find parties professing to come within the Government terms and partially fulfilling them, but the result will be that large tracts will fall into the hands of individuals.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The case of Prince Edward Island which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, is by no means analagous. There the landed proprietors were almost in the position of seigniors, settled on large tracts of lands which they held in fee simple. The whole idea was one of tenantry, of annual rental, and that is not what is contemplated here. It is not intended to have large continuous tracts of land, and I think, when it is considered that that country is as large as all Europe, it will be seen that there is not the slightest danger of a monopoly in land. It is well known that German and Scandinavian immigration depends largely on the power being given to those people, by agents or otherwise, to come and see the localities beforehand, as they have done in the north-western States. Then large tracts of land are selected in advance, and then they come in large bodies, bringing their clergyman, their doctor, so many mechanics, so many agriculturists, and unless they are allowed to settle together in that way they will not come at all. Perhaps, in the case of German or Irish or any other immigration, it would be better to have the different races scattered throughout the territory, so that by degrees they might amalgamate, and become, in the end, Canadians; but the first thing to do is to get them to come, and if they will not come readily and scatter over the country, then we must bring them out in communities. To do that these people must have persons to lead them. In Germany for instance they form parties who club purses and send out an agent or trustee to make the purchase of land for them. From England and Scotland such parties might be brought out by persons of capital, from benevolent motives, or by landlords for instance, who might desire to remove their tenants from the superabundant population of those countries; and it is only by providing these means that such immigration can be secured. I find that that feeling operates so strongly even in Canada, that we have frequently applications from forty or fifty or sixty young farmers or others in a particular county in Ontario for a tract of land, so that they might all settle together. At present we cannot accommodate these parties though it