

The member for Hants would do well to make the same candid admission in this matter that he had done in regard to the Grand Trunk Bill—that he was incorrect as to his facts.

Hon. Mr. Dorion said he had listened with great pleasure to the speech of the honourable member for Cumberland, but he could not help thinking that the greater portion of it was a mere repetition of that gentleman's electioneering difficulties. He did not think we were in a position to indulge in such glowing descriptions of our great strength and power; at any rate, others did not see us in that light. He had lately read an article in the *London Times* comparing Canada to a baby without strength, and only being allowed to live from the fact of its weakness. It had been said that the people of the old country despised us because we are colonists, and it was argued the possession of this territory would place us in a better position in the opinion of Englishmen and Scotchmen. Supposing the territory was acquired, would we be any less colonists, and would we not be still in the same position with reference to the mother country? He had no doubt there was a large extent of fertile and arable land in this North-West Territory, but unfortunately it was almost inaccessible, except through the United States. In reaching this Territory, immigrants had to pass through equally fertile territory in the United States, and much more accessible to the outside world. Under these circumstances, was it to be expected that immigrants would, in any great numbers, seek a more distant and less accessible territory? We know not what the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company were. We were asked, in effect, to vote an indefinite amount, no one knows how much, for the possession of this territory. True, the policy, in his opinion, was to urge the Imperial Government to determine what the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company are, and when that was determined Government could state to Parliament the exact sum required to meet those claims. But, by the proposition before the House, we were to vote an indefinite amount which could only be determined after it was too late to withdraw from the bargain. With five or six or more millions of acres of land in New Brunswick and Quebec, which would be opened up by the building of the Intercolonial Railway, he thought there need be no hurry to send our population to the North-West. With a floating debt of something like seven millions, with two millions

[Dr. Tupper (Cumberland)]

more to raise for public works, and the twenty millions for the Intercolonial Railroad, he thought we were not justified in voting an indefinite sum for the claims of the Hudson Bay Company, besides the large amount required to open up that country before it would be of any value as a field for immigration.

Hon. Mr. Chauveau (in French) argued that settlement had heretofore gone towards the Southwest, because the means of travel had been opened in that direction, but that if communication were opened up with the North-West, colonization would follow the line of travel, and settle that country. In reply to the member for Hants, he said the majority of the inhabitants of the North-West Territory were French Canadians, and from the French Canadian point of view they had nothing now to fear from the opening up of that country. If honourable members were to oppose these resolutions by conjuring up fears as to the future, they might be met by the fears that would have been excited in the past. Fifty years ago, who could have believed that Canada would have possessed these splendid Legislative Halls, or played the important part she is now doing in the affairs of the world? The honourable gentleman made an eloquent speech in favour of the resolutions.

Mr. Joly (in French) contended that after taking possession of the territory it would be too late to refuse the payment of whatever sum might be claimed as compensation for the Hudson's Bay Company.

Hon. Mr. Cartier (in French) explained the object of the amendment to place the settlement of the question under the control of Parliament; and thereafter reviewed some of the arguments advanced in opposition to the policy of the Government.

Mr. Mackenzie said the member for Cumberland (Dr. Tupper) complained that the Reformers of Upper Canada had deserted him in his struggles for Union in his own Province. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was glad that the Lower Provinces had entered the Union, but he had felt that he had no right to interfere in their local politics. He had not, for his own part, solicited the help or alliance of the gentlemen from the Lower Provinces, knowing that local politics and party interests which divided them, would require their attention, and he did not think that anything in the course taken by himself and friends could be construed into a wrong done to the mem-