

dictator had members of his party allowed him to have his own way. The hon. gentleman said: "What the hon. member for South Leeds said was strictly true. Mr. Archibald, as Governor of that Territory, had apprehension for the safety of the country, and those apprehensions were shared by others qualified to judge of the danger. It was deemed proper in the public interest that this money should be advanced, and it was procured from the hon. member for Selkirk. The right hon. member for Kingston took the same view when the circumstances were stated to him, as would be seen by the evidence of that hon. gentleman before the North-West Committee." Yet we have heard hon. gentlemen charging the Conservative party throughout this country, through the *Toronto Globe*, and before the constituencies of Ontario, with degrading themselves and the country and the constitution because Hon. D. A. Smith, in protecting the Hudson's Bay Company's interests, advised by Governor Archibald, paid out a certain sum of money without the cognisance of the right hon. gentleman then at the head of the Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) said:

"It was deemed proper in the public interest that this money should be advanced, and it was procured from the hon. member for Selkirk. The right hon. member for Kingston took the same view when the circumstances were stated to him, as would be seen by the evidence of that hon. gentleman before the North-West Committee. No doubt Governor Archibald intimated to Mr. Smith that he had no authority to pay this money, but there was equally as little doubt that he pledged the faith of the country as far as he could, to its repayment to the hon. member for Selkirk. This House should respect that pledge and vote money. The hon. member for Kingston would have been unworthy of his position if he failed to respect that pledge, and this House would be equally unworthy, if it refused to repay the money."

Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman's friends—I do not include him, because I scarcely think he would be capable of it—throughout Ontario, have over and over again represented, since the troubles broke out in the North-West, that the right hon. gentleman paid out public money, paid out secret service money, to keep Riel out of the country during the general election, and this \$1,000 and the \$3,500 having been made one sum, he is represented as having degraded the constitution, and as having been the means of keeping Riel alive and bringing him into the country to-day. Now, I think I have shown—and I regret to have been obliged to bring the matter up, but we were challenged to do so by the hon. member for West Huron—that the agitation with regard to Riel and the murder of poor Scott, was introduced into the House of Commons by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie); that he was followed with all the great power and ability which the hon. member for West Durham possesses, who carried it into the Local Legislature; spoke of it on the public hustings; offered a reward; refused in those telegrams of 1872 to say whether Riel was considered a murderer or not, and sent a promiscuous telegram, which would cover almost anybody except Riel, in consequence of the general election, and that, after coming into power, he voted that \$5,000 reward. Now, as to the disposal of the reward. Judge Wood reported in 1876 to the Ontario Government as follows:—

"In this sense, very many were instrumental in procuring the arrest of Lepine and Nault, and the outlawry of Riel and Donoghue. But I think the word "instrumental" means something more than counselling, approving of, and, when action was taken, supporting and defending those who took the responsibility of setting the law in motion, and of following it up as a private prosecutor until Lepine and Nault, two of the murderers of Scott were brought to trial before a court of competent jurisdiction, and on the trial appearing as prosecutor, and procuring and marshalling the evidence, and witnesses, which led to the conviction of Lepine, and should have secured and, eventually would have secured the conviction of Nault. The jury disagreed in the trial of Queen vs. Nault—tried at the same s-sizes as Lepine—and at the ensuing assizes, he was bailed in consequence of the amnesty resolutions passed in the House of Commons, and was finally, along with the other murderers of Scott, pardoned.

What became of the money? They made a general distribution, and there was a general grab. William A. Farmer, who served the warrant on Riel, got \$2,000; Francis A. Cornish, a very able lawyer, now dead, formerly mayor of London, and then living in Winnipeg, got \$400; C. B. Thibaudeau, \$400; Léon Dupont, \$330; John S. Ingram, \$330; Edward

Armstrong, (Sheriff), \$330; John A. Kerr, \$330; George M. Young, \$300; Thomas Hughes, \$290, and H. W. Smith, \$290. In fact one might imagine that almost the whole population of the Province at that time, received a portion of this money.

An hon. MEMBER. Probably they were all Grits.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not know whether they were all Grits or not, but I know if there was a distribution of money going on, and there were any Grits around, they would be likely to get a full share of it. I have traced what became of the money, I have shown how Riel was amnestied, I have shown who was responsible for that amnesty, and I have also shown, upon the statement made by gentlemen whose words would not be questioned in any intelligent body, and by the oaths of Ministers, that there was no promise of amnesty to Riel in 1872-3; that the amount of money paid at the suggestion of Archbishop Taché was first \$1,000, that Riel was not out of the country, during the election of 1872, and that furthermore, when the Reform party came into power, they paid \$3,600 due to Donald A. Smith, at the suggestion of Governor Archibald, and that throughout their whole career, there cannot be shown a weak point in the armour of the Conservative party on that question. People must measure the position in 1874 by a very different standard from that applied in 1870 and 1871, when there was hardly any constituted authority in Manitoba. The people having become enlightened upon these matters having read and judged, have changed their views materially, and they will change their views materially now, when they find the leader of the Opposition, who agitated Ontario from one end to the other, with regard to the outrageous conduct of red handed murderer Riel—to find the hon. gentleman espousing his cause, advocating that Riel's rights and grievances should be redressed—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman has no right to state that I have been advocating Riel's cause.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, he has.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman had better wait until he stops speaking.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I rise to order.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I certainly do not mean it in any offensive sense, and intended, had I not been interrupted, to have added, "as I will show by the evidence of Riel himself." Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to the delegation which waited on Riel at Clarke county, Montana. The hon. gentleman has read a number of extracts from that document, but I observe that he did not read them all, as in the case of many documents he reads official or otherwise. Although he claimed that some of the official documents were missing that should have been supplied by the department of Interior there were certainly some others which were missing, which were in the possession of the hon. gentleman himself, and which he did not read. Riel in reply to Dumont and others who waited on him, said:

"I doubt whether my advice given on this side of the boundary on matters relating to a foreign country can, when known among you, be of any value, but I will submit another consideration. The Canadian Government owe me 240 acres of land, in accordance with clause 31 of the Manitoba Act—

There is where the connection came in. The hon. gentleman being so proud to advocate the grievances of the half-breeds, must have been aware that he was advocating the cause of Riel, who now claims 240 acres of land.

"As well as five lots of a great value, on account of the hay and timber covering them, and of their situation on the river. These lots belong to me in accordance with the various sections of clause 32 of the above mentioned Act, and I have been deprived of them through the direct or indirect action of the Government."

Now, I think the hon. gentleman's amendment certainly covers that case:—