

of the Government. I consider that I am responsible personally for that policy; I am responsible also for the opening up of the lands; I am responsible in every way, and I am quite satisfied that the Government acted wisely in keeping out the land shark at the time it did, and equally wisely in opening up these lands for the settler at the proper time. Then the hon. gentleman attacked the colonization companies, as I believe he did on former occasions. Well, Sir, the colonization system was not initiated by the present Government. The colonization system, the granting of lands to capitalists for the purpose of inducing settlement, was inaugurated and carried out by our predecessors—carried out not to a very large extent, because they had not the opportunity, they had not the country, but they began the system and we have carried it on, and we have no reason to regret our having done so. In the first place, if we compare the Northern and Western States with the position of our own North-West, at the time we undertook the administration of affairs, we will find that the chief lands of the American North-West were granted to the American railways; that these railways have had agents all over the world, the best agents in the world, for the purpose of selling their lands. We had no large railway companies heavily subsidized at that time. The Government were using all the machinery they could possibly use, in the way of an Immigration Department, for the purpose of encouraging immigration. They could not do what private individuals or railway companies, or colonization companies could do. The Government carried out, to a very considerable extent, the policy of their predecessors, and that policy has, on the whole, been successful. There has been many and many an immigrant and settler who has gone in there through the agency of the colonization companies, who would not have gone in there but for these companies. Besides that, we had the commencement of the fund, and a very large and satisfactory commencement of the fund, out of which we have to repay to the Dominion Treasury the \$25,000,000 pledged to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. The assertion that in any way settlers were kept out of the country included in the colonization grants, is mistaken. Everybody knows who has looked at the regulations and the Government system, that the even-numbered sections in every colonization grant, are open to the homesteader just as much as if the land had not been included in the grant. Any homesteader can go on the land of any colonization company, and say this is No. 8 or No. 4 or No. 6, or any even-numbered section, and despite the company he can sit down on his land and can claim his patent and obtain his patent for it. The plan of the Government is simply this: that so far as the odd-numbered sections are concerned, they should get a price for them; that the money should be put in the Public Treasury to pay for the subsidy, and that the colonization companies, in order to make it a matter of interest to them to act as immigration agents and find settlers, should get the odd-numbered sections at half price if they found settlers to settle on the even-numbered sections. The consequence is, that some of the companies have failed. Some of them were, I am afraid, merely speculative companies, had not a *bona fide* intention of looking for settlers, but merely went in for the purpose of making something out of it. Some of them, on the other hand, have gone to great expense, have laid out large sums of money, and have agents traversing England, Ireland and Scotland for the purpose of bringing out immigrants to settle these lands. That is the policy of the Government, and I believe it has been successful, and I have no doubt that within three or four years more—because these companies have scarcely had time to work out this system or generate the capital in order to do so—but in a few years the country will acknowledge that the system was a good one, and that such of the companies as were *bona fide*—

as many of them were—became active, earnest, zealous, and successful agents in settling the North-West. The hon. gentleman alluded as one cause of discontent to the disallowance of certain local railway Bills. I would only ask the hon. gentleman to go to the people of Winnipeg and ask them whether they want any local railways running from the Canadian Pacific Railway west of them down to the Province line. Let him ask the people of Winnipeg, the place where the excitement has arisen, and he will find that any man who would venture to state that he was in favour of that system of allowing local railways to run wherever they pleased from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the frontier, would have very little chance of representing Winnipeg or the electoral district of which it is the centre. The hon. gentleman has said that one great cause of discontent is the high Tariff. Well, that is the old question of Protection against Free Trade. The people there are taxed no more by the high Tariff than the people in the other parts of the Dominion. The people of the other parts of the Dominion—I am sorry for the hon. gentleman's sake to say it, because I know it is a disappointment to him—are submitting to the National Policy in a spirit of Christian resignation and a spirit of Christian hope and expectation. Besides, when we talk to the people of the North-West we can say to them, Would you rather have Free Trade and a deficit and no railway, or Protection and a high Tariff, with the Canadian Pacific Railway and a surplus? and I think the people, *en masse*, if the question were put to them, would decide in favour of Protection and the surplus and the Canadian Pacific Railway instead of a deficit, no railway, and Free Trade. There would be the glorious privilege of buying American manufactures at their border, if American manufactures could be carried or transported by toboggans or waggons across the plains, in the absence of a railway. The hon. gentleman said that he did not wish to commit himself in any way with respect to the cry for a Hudson Bay Railway. There is a natural impatience in the North-West for want of transport, of course, and hence the cry for the Hudson Bay Railway. That Parliament is anxious to assist such an enterprise is shown by its chartering two companies. These two companies, I am glad to believe, are about to amalgamate, so that they will unite their strength to build a railway from the Pacific Railway—I suppose in the vicinity of Winnipeg—to Hudson Bay. That is the action of Parliament. The action of the Government has been this: in order to encourage that railway, if it has any vitality—and I do not mean to say that it has not vitality and a great future before it—I am not competent to speak as to that; but the Government, in order to encourage it, have agreed to give a larger land grant to that railway and at a lower price than to any other railway that has been subsidized in the North-West, except the Canadian Pacific Railway itself. They have agreed to give twice the quantity of land, and at half the price, that they have given to the Manitoba and South-Western, and the other railways which are projected through that country. Well, there is a natural feeling of impatience in the country, because the people cannot get their crops out; hence the great agitation for the immediate construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. They are now obliged to send their grain by foreign railways to eastern Canada. They are obliged to send it to the boundary line and there take the American railways. The American railways, of course, consider only their own interest. They have no interest in common with those people, and do not care whether they suffer or not. They put on just what tariff they please for their own purposes. But, Mr. Speaker, in two years the scene will be changed. There will be two routes through Canada. There will be the all-rail route running from Calgary through the whole of the wheat district and to the north of Lake Superior, direct to Montreal and the sea; and