

vey parties have been working between the Thunderhill branch of the Canadian Northern railway and the Prince Albert branch, and others in the vicinity of the part, in districts where the land would not be used for at least fifty years. I regard this as a serious waste of money which could be avoided for the present at any rate.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I myself have made the same complaint, but frequently, in the northern portions of the three provinces, someone goes in and locates a mineral claim which he wants to file, and the difficulty arises in regard to the location. So that we have at least to ascertain some point from which registration can take place. I agree with my hon. friend that it is a mistake to go on with indiscriminate surveying in areas that are not likely to be settled, but we have to meet the difficulty in connection with mining claims.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There are many areas in which there is no evidence of minerals, and it seems to me that conditions are only complicated as a result of these surveys. When you survey land a long distance from the railway, someone immediately files a claim for some of that land and gets possession of it. You then have a small settlement, and immediately there comes a demand for a branch railway. This survey work should be dispensed with entirely in the present state of the country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree with my hon. friend that it has been very expensive to the provincial governments in the past, but it is very difficult to prevent settlers going in and even squatting in these areas; in fact, it is impossible to prevent. I had some notion of recommending to Parliament that we cease granting free homesteads, but again I am met with an insistent demand that it continue. So I am in a quandary. We want people to come into Canada and settle on the land, and I confess it is very difficult to determine what to do. If squatters get in you have difficulties and demands for surveys. I think some of the work might very well be curtailed.

Mr. RYCKMAN: This is one of those large items whose appearance in the right-hand column seems to be justification for its appearing in the left-hand column; in other words, having been voted last year, it must of necessity be voted this year. I believe the minister is as anxious as any of us in these times of stress to practise economy, and I should like him

[Mr. Campbell.]

to tell the committee if this is not one of the items where a sizable sum, say \$50,000, could be stricken off, and the affairs of the country in this particular be still carried on satisfactorily for the ensuing year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I very much sympathize with the remarks of my hon. friend, but I think he would have been better advised if he had suggested cutting this particular item in two instead of lopping off only \$50,000.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I accept the amendment.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of course, I have no knowledge what the requirements of the department were in this respect, but the first request that came to me was \$160,000 higher than the amount which now appears in the estimates. But I find the Department of the Interior has very wide ramifications, and I should like to have a few months in order to become acquainted with some of the work carried on by it. I would undertake to say that areas that are not required for settlement should not be surveyed. If a definite policy were adopted in connection with immigration and land settlement, there would be no necessity for any further surveys for a considerable period. But in the meantime I might inform the committee that every dollar of this vote is allocated, and some of the survey parties are already on their way to the scene of operations; therefore, I should very much regret having to curtail the expenditure for this year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The money may be allocated, Mr. Chairman, but it is not yet expended.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Would any serious injury be done to the country if for the present year we had a survey holiday? We hear of naval holidays and armament holidays, so why not a survey holiday? I am inclined to think from what I have heard in this and previous discussions on the subject that the surveyed areas, particularly in the Northwest, are so vast that it will be generations before they are ever settled. I know the policy of the last twenty or twenty-five years has been to go ahead with surveys far in advance of the requirements of settlement, but I was rather surprised when I heard to-day from my friend on the left, I think from Prince Albert, that in the neighborhood of The Pas the surveys are at least fifty years in advance of any