not pass through the part of the country | that is being settled. It strikes out north and west from Selkirk, and traverses an uninhabited and uninhabitable country, by the narrows of Lake Manitoba, for hundreds of miles. There is not a settlement on the line, except Selkirk, and yet, perforce, we must have other railways built to remedy the blunder in the location of our national highway. All the financial energies of this country, we are told, have been, and are being taxed for the purpose of constructing this Pacific Railway, and yet we are to build other roads and subsidize them with grants of land! I have no doubt this scheme is one that was talked of last Session in the lobbies of this House -to build a line from Emerson, one of our settlements close to the border, and pursue a north-westerly course passing through a section of the country that the Pacific Railway ought to have served. Ι have no doubt such a railway would pay, but what would be the results ?--- not a bushel of grain, not an article of export, would Pacific Railway, but pass over our through American channels. Would any person of common sense, looking at the map, imagine for a moment that the products of the country would pass by way of Emerson, and afterwards take the Caroute? We have nadian Pacific in Canada the best means of doing that What is the Welland carrying trade. Canal being enlarged for ? To do not only our own, but also a large portion of the United States' carrying trade. We have in our magnificent water stretches, to which the Secretary of State so frequently refers, the best and cheapest route. We are building the Fort Frances Lock, and yet we are to have a route via Emerson, to carry our trade to the United States. I would like to see the North-West developed. It is worth developing. It is the backbone of the country. It is the great wheat-producing portion of Canada, but in the way the Government are expending our money and proposing to expend it, instead of our getting the benefit from such expenditure, the Americans will have it at our ex-Look at the Fort Francis Lock ! pense. I can point to American papers which say that the large expenditure made there is for the benefit of the lumbermen of Minnesota. We have no timber, or but Hon. Mr. Aikins.

little, on our side, and yet this expenditure is going on, while the very thing our people most desire—the construction of the road from Thunder Bay to Red River —is delayed.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—An hon. gentleman opposite, on your own side of politics, differs from you.

, Hon. Mr. AIKINS—I am only responsible for my own views. I know the people of the North-West are anxious to have our own route opened up.

Hou. Mr. PENNY-I am with you. Hon. Mr. AIKINS,-I hope the hon. gentleman will bring his influence to bear on the Government to have that road With reference to other paragraphs built. of the Speech, I do not think they amount to very much. The fact is, we have had nearly all of those statements made in the public press. It is true, this is the official way of communicating them to us. The only thing new announced this evening, is the statement made by my hon. friend behind me, from Prince Edward Island, and that is, it was highly important that a governor should be sent to Battleford, in the person of Mr. Laird, in order that when Sitting Bull came across the boundary line no complication should arise. I should like to have the correspondence on that subject laid before us. So far as Sitting Bull is concerned, and the negotiations with the American troops and officials, I believe they took place through Col. McLeod, and not through Lieut.-Governor Laird. Ι think it very questionable whether Governor Laird had anything to do with it, but the hon. gentleman wanted a reason for sending him to the North-West, and found in this Sitting Bull incident an argument in favor of sending him to administer the affairs of an uninhabited country.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON moved that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow. Carried.

The House adjourned at six o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Tuesday, February 12th.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

After routine,

 $\mathbf{26}$