

Montreal by some students, I think. There was a procession of the students, followed by a large meeting where speeches were delivered; and what were the speeches in the presence of this population already excited by the reports it had received the day before, headed by the word "Revenge?" These people met in this way, and what do we find that they were told on that occasion? They were told this:

"This execution is a stain on the English flag, and an insult to our nationality. If Riel has been executed it is essentially because he was a Catholic, and because he had French blood in his veins."

Now, Sir, where can you find anything more inflammatory than a speech of that kind, delivered on an occasion of that kind, and delivered, as we are told by the same paper, by a man who was standing upon a cannon and holding the national flag in his hand, exciting them all the more? And this in a large city like Montreal, where we all know how easy it is to raise a dangerous excitement amongst the people. The orator spoke holding a flag in his hand, and thus making the occasion as tragical as possible, standing on a cannon, and proclaiming to the people that Riel was hanged because he was a Roman Catholic and because he had French blood in his veins. Now, Sir, I say that is extremely reprehensible. Going on, we find that the young man who spoke is reported to have said:

"Riel will be placed side by side with the political martyrs of 1837-38, and his name will remain engraved in our hearts, and when the hour of vengeance shall strike we will bite those who have bitten us."

Using the word "vengeance" on this occasion—is not that very reprehensible again? Was I not right in New Brunswick, when these reports reached us, in refusing to join the movement? And I may say, that these reports reached us more quickly than other reports usually do, whether there was an object in it, I do not know. My constituents received some of these papers that contained some of the inflammatory addresses, that contained these inflammatory headings. They received these papers in which I myself was attacked, because I had ventured to say a word on the other side. But why did these papers come so numerous to my constituents as they did on that occasion? It was for the purpose of spreading the excitement that had started so unjustly, in my opinion, from the Province of Quebec into New Brunswick. I say again, Sir, what other meaning could my constituents, what other meaning could the people of New Brunswick, put upon these reports but that the French Canadian people for whom we have very strong sympathy indeed, a people whom we love, a people to whom we look for sympathy and support in every question in which we may be concerned, and a people whom we have to thank for their sympathy and support in the past when we were in distressing circumstances, politically speaking—I say, what other conclusion could we come to than the one which I have indicated? "Sir, these inflammatory appeals have been sown broadcast among my constituents, and are they not right in saying: Why, the French people of Lower Canada are up in arms against all the rest of the Dominion? The leaders of the agitation were endeavoring to excite the people down in New Brunswick, and was it right for me to join in an agitation of that kind? I say, no, Sir, and I thought it my duty to say to those men who had written to me, that I believed my duty lay in another direction, and, moreover, I was not convinced that it was wrong to hang Riel, and not being convinced even of that, it was so much the more wrong in me to join in an agitation of that kind. We go a little further, and we find on the 17th of November, something else of the same kind. I find the following despatch from the city of Quebec:—

"The *Electeur* has appeared in mourning, and its articles are very violent. All its columns are devoted to Riel, and it invites French Canadians not to forget the martyr who was assassinated for the French cause."

Mr. LANDRY (Kent).

Is not that the same thing again? Is there not another strong and reprehensible appeal to those same people again? "Let not the French Canadians forget the martyr who has been assassinated for the French cause!" I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask other people of this country, whether that is a proper sentiment to be given utterance to: "Do not forget the martyr Louis Riel?" Louis Riel a martyr! Who can look at his antecedents and call him a martyr? Who can look at what he had done in the North-West, and call him a martyr? You may do that if you will, but by all that is good, do not say that he died in the French cause. Louis Riel dying for the French cause; Louis Riel dying for the Catholic cause if you will! Why, Sir, what French cause did he represent? I should like to know. Was he doing so at the time when he would not heed the advice of the priests or of the missionaries in the North-West, who were trying to effect the greatest good possible among the half-breeds whom Riel pretended to guide and to lead on to what he told them was for their benefit and material advantage? Was it because he despised their counsels and turned against them, and even disavowed the religion in which he had been brought up? Was it for this that he is said to have died for representing the French cause? If ever a mistaken appellation was given to a man, it is to say that he is a martyr and that he died representing the French cause. I should be very loath to admit that he represented anything of what I have conceived to be the French cause and French characteristics in Canada, the French Canadians as well as the French Acadians. I should be very loath to say that he represented any such cause. Represented it! How? Did he represent it when he was forcing those people to take up arms against the Government? Was he representing it when, as they themselves have sworn, and as I believe they assert now, generally, if not every one of those who joined with him in that rebellion, that they did so because they were afraid of their lives and because he forced them to do so? The only cause, so far as he interpreted it, which he was representing was his own cause. He was not even representing the cause of the Metis. How many joined him in the rebellion? They were not so very numerous. We have not, perhaps, the authentic figures, but I think the calculation is that there were between 250 and 300 French half-breeds in that rebellion. How many did they represent? We are told by the late census that there are something between 4,700 and 4,800 half-breeds in the North-West, and at a fair calculation there would be between 1,000 and 1,200 capable of bearing arms. How many do we find followed Riel? Something like 250 or 300 as I have said followed him. Out of all those whose testimony we have been able to get, almost every one has declared that he was obliged to follow Riel because he was afraid of his life. Was he representing their cause when he was forcing them into a rebellion which they did not desire? It cannot be said that Riel represented their cause. By his own declarations he was not representing the cause of the French Canadians or the French half-breeds, or of any of the French. Why, then, should it be said he died because he represented the French cause? I cannot subscribe to any such sentiment. I might go on and read a great many more such extracts, but I will not make myself tedious to the House by doing so. What I have cited is quite sufficient to show that I was right in condemning the agitation which I then thought unjustifiable, and I declared that it was one which the people who took part in it would regret before many days or months had passed. I repeat that statement now, and I believe that since that time they have had occasion to regret it. Some may have not had occasion to do so if they have been able to make political capital out of it, but they will be the minority. I believe the larger number, even if they felt they could