

be pushed too far, and although I should regret as much and perhaps a great deal more than the hon. gentleman and his friends, to see the prospects of this country blighted by any injury done to Manitoba or by any severance between Manitoba and ourselves, still I warn the hon. gentleman that he and his colleagues are trying the temper of that people too much. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that our position, as a confederate system, has always two serious physical obstacles to contend with. On the east, between ourselves and our brethren of the Maritime Provinces, there extends a great tract of scarcely peopled country, traversed only by the single line of the Intercolonial; and, as he well knows, on the west these is a similar expanse, which it would be very difficult to people and colonize at an early date. Under these circumstances, we ought, in common prudence, if for no higher motive, to be very careful indeed how we give just cause for dissatisfaction to the people of Manitoba. I do not think that our policy, either our Tariff or our land policy, or our railway policy, has been such as to give fair play to the people of Manitoba, or is calculated to make them at all pleased or contented with the condition of affairs under the administration of the present Government. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have been pursuing, in my mind, a policy of alienation for some time. They have shown, both one and the other of them, very little regard for the interests of Manitoba. They have not hesitated to impose special taxes, specially obnoxious to an agricultural people. The Minister of Railways has not hesitated to proclaim on the floor of this House that, if the interests of Canada and Manitoba clash, Manitoba must go to the wall. That was a very foolish statement, a very unstatesman-like statement, a statement which I think he must have regretted, a statement which I think he ought to retract at the earliest possible moment. The interest of Canada is to assist Manitoba. The interests of Canada and Manitoba cannot be dissevered. The hon. gentleman should know that we have staked so much on developing the North-West that we cannot afford to allow the people of Manitoba to become discontented with our rule; and the hon. gentleman might perhaps remember this, that if there is such a general content, if there is such a feeling of well-being in Manitoba, it is a most extraordinary thing that, the moment you go into Dakota and the States adjoining, you find hundreds and thousands of Canadians, who had been in Manitoba, who liked Manitoba, who thought it a better country than Dakota, but, who, by reason of bad Government and bad regulations, were obliged, contrary to their own inclinations, to forsake their own flag and seek an asylum elsewhere. Perhaps it was as well in one respect that they did so, because, knowing what I do of the temper of my fellow-countrymen, it might have been dangerous for the hon. gentleman and his Government if these men had staid there. Knowing the conduct of those hon. gentlemen, one is almost driven to suspect that they are afraid that the North-West will grow too fast; that they are afraid that the people of the North-West will rise up and become something like another Ontario too soon to suit their purpose, and that they are conspiring together to check its growth. They could not do it better than by the policy they have been recently adopting, and, if that is their object, then the hon. gentleman is justified in congratulating himself on having achieved a brilliant success. But, if that is not his object, if he does desire, as I would fain hope he does, to develop Manitoba and the North-West and fill it with a prosperous population, then never were any men so infatuated in endeavouring to carry out such an end as the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Mr. WATSON. As seconder of this amendment, I shall occupy the attention of the House for a very short time. We have heard some very good speeches on this question,

and I think the members of the House have been enlightened on a good many points of interest. I was a little surprised to hear some statements from the Minister of Railways. We, in Manitoba, appreciate the railway, but we should appreciate it a great deal better without monopoly. As I do not intend to occupy the attention of this House long, I will come to a few points I have marked down here. The hon. gentleman has lauded the Premier of the Province of Manitoba as being a great statesman, able to cope with all the elements that have taken place there, and he referred to the farmers, the people who were formulating those grievances to the Government, as a class of disappointed speculators. Now, I might call his attention to the fact that this hon. Premier he speaks of is probably one of the disappointed speculators. Speaking as Premier of the Province, in his manifesto to the Government, he stated:

"These facts are now have been laid before the Government at Ottawa, but either through inappreciation of them, or a disbelief in their existence, only such relief has been given as would tide over the difficulty for the time being, and no adequate provision made for the exigencies of Government that have arisen under the state of affairs just cited. The provision allowed by our requirements being now so inadequate, the contemplation of our position when a great influx of population multiply the expense of Government, is a far from pleasant prospect, but a fact that must be faced. Indeed, a large addition to the population of the Province would be nothing short of an evil in disguise; rapid settlement of the territory would prove anything but a blessing; to meet increasing requirements under present circumstances would be an impossibility, our revenue being out of all proportion to our necessary expenditure."

Now, I hope, as the hon. the Minister of Railways has spoken of the deputation appointed by the Local Legislature to investigate these matters, that the grievances complained of by the Local Legislature will be attended to. I might state, also, that I was a little surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state, as he has stated before in this House, about the town of Portage la Prairie, that I live in, what would it be without a railway. We in the Portage never felt we had the Minister of Railways to thank for the Railway running there.

Mr. BOWELL. Whom did you thank?

Mr. WATSON. A deputation of that town was appointed to wait on the Minister when he visited Winnipeg, for the purpose of having him state that the railway would run through Portage la Prairie. He stated to the deputation—and one of them was the hon. gentleman who represented Marquette at that time—that it was impossible for the railway to run in there, but that it would go six or seven miles north of that. But he changed his mind after, at the dictation of two of the gentlemen who formed the Syndicate and wanted to get the contract. It was at some point outside of Winnipeg on the Canadian Pacific Railway. He was dictated to by these gentlemen, for the purpose, probably, of getting the support of the member for Marquette to that contract, that the road had to run into Portage la Prairie. He obeyed them at that time, has obeyed them since, and will obey them again. I shall not detain the House longer. I endorse heartily this Resolution, and endorse the statements that have been made by the hon. mover.

Mr. MILLS. I just wish to make an observation before the question is put, and shall not detain the House for five minutes. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Railways say that this motion was moved at a time when it must be considered a motion of want of confidence in the Government. I deny that this is a motion of want of confidence in the Administration. The hon. gentleman must know the constitutional practice;—in England it is a well recognized rule, that the redress of grievances must precede Supply, and it is never considered a vote of want of confidence to ask for the redress of a national grievance upon going into Committee of Supply. In fact, the whole theory of parliamentary government, the growth of the power of the House of Commons, originated in the principle that supplies are withheld until the grievances of the nation are redressed.