

his country. I had heard that French-Canadians had been induced by some of the Rouges to place that picture in their houses, alongside the pictures of holy men of their church, whose lives to them were incentives to good living. Holding up that picture, I denounced those who, in the Province of Quebec, could be guilty of sacrilege in the manner I have described. That speech was delivered on Tuesday night, the last night of the month. On the following day the nomination was held at the same place, Cayuga. Not one single reference was made at that nomination to this matter, although there were present many of the same audience who had been there the night before. On Thursday, the day following, the *Hamilton Times*, which you know is not friendly to the Government—in fact it is almost as unfriendly as the paper in this city, under the directorship of Hon. David Mills (laughter)—this paper on Thursday referred to my mission in Haldimand, and if you have read it you will see how little I was open to the charge, even in the opinion of this paper, of having in any way whatever insulted the Roman Catholics. Here was what the *Times* said, two days after that speech was delivered, and with special reference to the nomination:—(Mr. White here read from the *Times* an article in which it was stated that he had been withdrawn from Haldimand because his utterances were too *pro* Catholic, and conflicted with the high ground taken by Mr. Clarke Wallace and Mr. Dalton McCarthy.) Here two days after that speech was delivered, I found myself attacked for being *pro* Catholic instead of anti-Catholic, and had been withdrawn because my Protestant principles were not sufficiently high to suit the *Mail* programme (cheers). Now, what happened? It was not for a week after that the *Globe* started this story about me holding up this portrait and calling it the latest Catholic saint, because they thought they might do the most injury, not to me personally, but to the Liberal-Conservative party with which I was identified (applause). Some time after this, a friend of mine sent me a copy of the *Montreal Witness* of the 9th of August, and pointed out that the statement which I had made at Haldimand in condemnation of the use of this picture in Quebec, had also been made in a sermon by the parish priest of Notre Dame Church in Montreal:—(Mr. White read the extract, which announced that in his sermon, the priest said he had heard of the hanging of these pictures of Riel alongside the pictures of holy men of the church. This practice he condemned in the strongest language.) So you will see that this expression which I used on the platform denouncing the sacrilege of those who would place this picture in juxtaposition to the pictures of holy men of the Catholic Church, had actually been made in a Roman Catholic Church, and the practice I referred to condemned by the Rev. Cure, who was preaching in that church (cheers). In continuing, Mr. White showed how the familiar method of getting up an affidavit on the matter had been adopted by his opponents, and how *Grit* journals had religiously excluded the explanations which had by himself and others been made. He also said:—I should deeply regret if it could be charged against me that I had insulted any man because of his religious persuasion. I have been for thirty-five years engaged in my own humble way discussing public questions in this Province. I have addressed audiences of French-Canadians in Quebec, and because I have stood shoulder to shoulder with those people, I was accused of being a rotten Protestant by those who are now anxious to catch that vote. I may say that in politics I have no sympathy with those who mix up religious questions, for the simple reason that in this young country there is work enough for us all to do, to make, by united effort, of this country, what we all desire it to become (cheers). I desire now to refer to the speech which was recently delivered in this city by the French leader of the Liberal party, Mr. Laurier. Those of you who had an opportunity of hearing him can testify to his great eloquence and to his personal presence, with which he worthily impresses any audience he addresses. I have not a word to say against his personality, further than to say he has made a great mistake in relation to this particular question; but I desire to point out some facts which he omitted—of course, accidentally (laughter)—in relation to this question of the North-west rebellion: You all understand that the attacking party has a great advantage. All he had to do was to recite passages from petitions, and to assume that these petitions had been neglected. Then, by giving play to that eloquence of which he is so great a master, he hoped to make his audiences believe that these people had serious grievances. I propose, and I think I shall not be unsuccessful, to make a simple, plain statement of the facts connected with the half-breeds of the North-west, and the action of the Government in relation thereto, and when I have done, I think I can leave you to judge how far these people had even a palliation for the offence which they committed in rebelling against the Crown, and how far any Privy Councillor, sworn to protect the Crown, could say that if he had been on the banks

of the Saskatchewan the half-breeds obtained possession of the land. Canadiana when the Government the Indian Archibald, meration of be protected was set as enumeration different map 190 acres when, Sir Mackenzie have gone or fell through employed he had finished half-breed. other places Territories, impossible moved off who was the accept a com On the 3rd scattered grants there must trust would not years. To Mills was a ought to ha not do that to apprecia opponents v day after d very thing.

"It is no interests they

That w two years, time for on Ryan write extended?" consideration that it was claims." to investig he tells him tension of t to investig the bill. It attempt to and it was man Ryan paid for his course of s such as yu tions, whic Minister was to give been taken This policy