J. Ross, Esq.

solely; I speak of what I think desirable for the Canadian Government and people.

February 1857. 78. Do you know

8

78. Do you know the extent to which new territories are created by the United States?—I know the usual process.

79. I refer to the extent of territory over which they pass; take Iowa, for instance ?—Iowa has been settling for these last 20 years; I believe the first settlements in Iowa were made in 1834 or 1835.

80. When Iowa was begun to be settled there were very large masses of unsettled land, but still people went to Iowa ?— There were, but they were not very good lands, poor lands.

81. Chairman.] Iowa, I believe, is a country of remarkable fertility ?---It is.

82. Mr. Roebuck.] But, on the Gennessees there were very large quantities of very fertile land unoccupied ?—If there were, they were held at so high a price that it was not within the means of the class of settlers to occupy them; they were held, for instance, at the rate of 100 dollars, or about that; they could not be bought for twice that now.

83. Before Iowa was settled, did they not create a new territory west of Iowa? —My impression is that they did not; I think the territory of Wisconsin was a little before that time begun to be settled, and within the next year or so, Iowa was thrown off, but I do not think that previously to the opening of the Iowa Settlement, there was any country to the west of it at all.

85. Might not that same circumstance occur in Canada, that, before Canada was filled up, people might travel farther westward ?—You will observe that all these territories are adjacent to settlements; for instance, if a settlement began on Iowa, there would be a starting point for the settlement of a territory beyond, but when you have a space of 1,800 miles intervening, and probably more than that, it does not seem to me a convenient course of settlement.

86. Is that accurate respecting the Oregon territory; that was not contiguous to any territory whatsoever?—The Oregon territory was not settled from Canada.

87. I am talking of a settlement from the United States ?-Oregon hed been partially settled before the United States got possession of it.

88. I am endeavouring to point out to you that Oregon is an isolated territory, far from any other settled territory, and still people go there — If people go there, they usually go by sea; at least, they did so until the overland route to California was established. Of course, it is well enough known that a few persons had travelled across the continent before that time, but very few persons, and in going there they went round by sea; now there is no way of getting round by sea to the Red River Settlement. If you go there you must either go directly across the country from the west end of Lake Superior, or you can take the better route through the United States, and by St. Paul's.

89. Mr. Charles Fitzwilliam.] Is it not the fact that, annually, at least 4,000 emigrants cross from the Missouri River to the Oregon territory ?—1 should doubt it; I am not inclined to believe it.

90. To California?—I am not able to say the number.

91. Chairman.] Is not settlement progressing fast in the vicinity of the Red River, on the American side of the frontier?—Not in the vicinity, I think. I stated awhile ago that I thought it was at least 800 or 1,000 miles from the last settlement to the north of St. Paul's, to the first settlement at the Red River.

92. Sir John Pakington.] Do you mean that there is no intervening settlement whatever in those 800 or 1,000 miles ?—I believe there is no intervening settlement; I may overstate the distance a couple of hundred miles.

93. Mr. Grogan.] There are railways running into St. Paul's, are there not, or very near it ?---Within a few miles.

95. Mr. Edward Ellice.] I think you said just now that Mr. Whitney, who

had