

that the hon. gentleman closed his remarkable speech with a statement that was most remarkable: that the English lost America by refusing to consider just such claims as those made by the North-West. Where did the hon. gentleman find the analogy between the claims put forward by the old British colonists of the present United States of America and these claims? I am afraid the hon. gentleman found no analogy; but it was lying on his mind that, while he himself refused to give support and countenance to any of the demands which he claims are unaddressed to-day, that hon. gentleman wanted to suggest to those parties that all they have to do is to menace this country with danger and disaster, to create the impression that the North-West is not that great fertile country which it has been supposed to be, and that great country which is to supply homes for the homeless in every part of the world, but he wants to let the loyal and law-abiding citizens of other countries know not only that the people there are down-trodden and oppressed, but also that if they go there they are removing to a country which is going to be shattered by discontent and by disunion, and where there is no prosperity to be found, but where they are exchanging adversity which surrounds them for a still worse condition. I say that a greater disaster to Canada could not occur than the course taken by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, than the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, in fomenting that discontent which is calculated to prevent the hundreds of thousands of people who to-day are looking to the great fertile territories of the North-West, as that country which, above all others, presents the most inviting and the most advantageous prospect of providing, not only happy homes, but the opportunity of obtaining that competence which men desire to provide for those coming after them as well as for themselves. What the hon. gentleman read here—I will not say for what purpose—will be used by the enemies of Canada and by the land companies endeavouring to draw people to other countries—these statements will be quoted as antagonistic to Canada, statements which the hon. gentleman knows can be met with testimony a thousand times greater and a thousand fold stronger, of hundreds and thousands who have gone into Manitoba and the North-West Territory and who, to day, testify that it would be impossible for any industrious, enterprising, energetic man to find in the wide world a country which would offer him greater prosperity than the North-West. Professor Tanner, a disinterested authority, the Government Professor of Agriculture at South Kensington, London, knowing the attention given to this subject of Manitoba and the North-West, and finding the conflicting statements made as to the character of the country as a field for immigration, left his home and came to this country. He went to the North-West and travelled over 5,000 miles, and having travelled from house to house, having taken every opportunity of interviewing the people, and learning from them what their own feelings were as to the success that attended the exchange of the one country for the other, he returned with the declaration that it would be impossible for any person to have met with more complete and triumphant answers to these libels on the country, which are scattered broadcast and sent to the various papers in England and elsewhere, in order to decry and depress the country. I give that high and disinterested testimony as an answer to these individual complaints, for they are nothing else. The hon. gentleman read from a Scotch newspaper—from some person of whom we know nothing. Did he not see that Lady Cathcart's Factor, a man of education, intelligence and information, visited the country thoroughly, that he was sent out by Lady Cathcart, who contributed £100 per family, and sent out a number of families from Scotland to that North-West country, and that that gentleman, on his return, having visited the country and visited the people at their own homes, gave the most

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

unqualified testimony, not only to the magnificent character of the country itself, its great fertility and the enormous advantages of settling in it, but to the happy contentment which he found pervading the minds of all the people who were able to exchange Scotland for that country. Knowing this, as the hon. gentleman must have known it, knowing that testimony abounds on every side, of the highest and most disinterested character, as to the success which has attended the immigrants who have gone into that country, he yet stands here by the hour and retails these miserable statements, from perhaps some disappointed speculators who were perhaps unable to realize sudden fortunes, for the purpose of inciting discontent and doing that which he knows, and which every man knows, is calculated to strike the most fatal blow that can be struck at the development of that great country which is so rapidly making Canada a country of which every Canadian may be proud.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is satisfactory to find that the hon. gentleman has recovered something of his old, pristine vigour, and I may add, more than his old recklessness of assertion. Perhaps, now that he has found his voice, he may go one step further and support his arguments by his vote. If he does it will be the first time since the House has met that we will have seen the vote on record of the hon. gentleman who is not the member for Cumberland.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I call the hon. gentleman to order for his statement that I am not the member for Cumberland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a Bill to make him so.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not in order to make any such statement. The hon. gentleman has a seat here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, Sir, I will alter the phrase, and I will say, the hon. gentleman who now sits for Cumberland, and to secure whose seat a Bill is before this House. Sir, the hon. gentleman asks why my hon. friend did not move earlier. Why, Sir, how could he move earlier? How could he move until those negotiations which were going on had closed, until we knew whether or not the hon. gentleman was going to grant the demands of Mr. Norquay and his friends? What time have we had? Why, Sir, almost from the moment this House met, from the moment the hon. gentleman opposite made his Budget Speech, we were occupied in testing the accuracy of his former statement, by granting a further gift, for it amounted to that, of \$30,000,000 to the Company of which the hon. gentleman boasts so much, and which he told us was never going to cost the country a dollar after the enormous grant originally given. The hon. gentleman talks, as his friends have talked on every occasion, when their misdeeds have been brought to light by hon. gentlemen on this side, of our want of patriotism and of our exciting discontent. Why, Sir, cannot they vary that old refrain, even for a single moment? It is the same old answer which has been made to every complaint made from this side of the House. When we point out the abominable extravagance of this Government, when we show, as I showed not long ago, that while entering on our career as a nation, we did so under conditions which gave us enormous advantages over the people of the United States, we have been, or the Government have been, so false to their trust, that Canada to-day is labouring under an expenditure nearly double per head of that in the United States; and when these facts, which should be known to every ratepayer in the country, are brought out, what is the answer? Can they prove the statement incorrect? No, Sir; but they say it is unpatriotic to state the fact. Sir, the unpatriotic conduct is in bringing about such a state of things, and not in calling the attention of the people to