

over the country and which has been encouraged by Government organs and even by ministers. It is insinuated that this agitation was due to the fact that Riel was a Frenchman. There was no foundation for such a rumour. The case of the Government must be a very bad one indeed in their own estimation and that of their friends when they have to use such means to defend it. The most important immediate reasons of the beginning of the present movement are :—

1st. That according to moral laws, any party who may be the cause of why a crime is committed is himself a criminal, and consequently that the Government of the day having, by their bad administration of the North-West Territories during past eight years, provoked the people of that country by starving them, and otherwise, they are responsible for the rebellion, and as a logical consequence of such a responsibility, having, as they have, the power to do so, they were bound to use all possible clemency towards Riel and his people

2nd. That the jury, though composed of men adverse to Riel and his people, having declared upon their oath that Riel deserved *mercy*, the Government, responsible as they are for the rise of this quiet people, were in duty bound to grant such *mercy*.

3rd. That considering the whole evidence as it now stands before the public, the least that can be inferred is that there is a strong doubt as to Riel's mental capacity, and it being a general and well known principle that the accused party has a right to have the benefit of any doubt which may exist, he could not be put to death.

4th. That the Government, during last session and during the troubles, having refused to alter the old laws of the North-West Territories and make them somewhat uniform with the laws of the provinces, have shown a determination to deal unjustly with those people.

5th. That the *memorandum* of the late Minister of Justice, Sir Alexander Campbell, is such that any honest man after having read it over and compared every part of it with the facts as they really are, cannot help coming to the conclusion that the Government had no good reasons to act as they did. That Riel was sacri-

ficed to a cry of hatred and of vengeance, and consequently that the Government is responsible for the death of the half-breed chief and of all the other victims of the troubles of last year.

Such are some of the immediate causes of the agitation which has spread not only in the Province of Quebec, but also throughout the American continent, and even across the Atlantic. This movement may be stronger in our province than it is in other parts of the Dominion, but this would only show, if true, that our people have faith in responsible government, and that they understand their responsibility for the good or bad administration of the affairs of the country by their representatives in Parliament and by the advisers of the Crown. Where, then, is the question of nationality so far as this part of the question goes? Is not the agitation a movement in favor of justice and humanity, and what has to do with it the nationality to which may belong the party who was sentenced to death and executed? Whether he be a Scotchman, an Englishman, an Irishman or a Frenchman, does not change the issue. Why, then, should the Government have tried to stir up such feelings of races? Was it not sufficient for dishonest newspapers, generally well paid for doing such dirty work, to raise such a cry? Is the case of the Government so bad in their own estimation that they believe they could not defend it if they should use honest means?

The hon. Postmaster-General has tried to excuse the policy pursued towards the Indians by stating that the Government have done all in their power to prevent them from starving, adding that the treaties with the tribes demonstrate the justice and liberality with which they have been treated. In answer to the hon. gentleman's statement, I will read some extracts from a letter written by a gentleman of high standing in the North-West, where he has passed the greater part of his life amongst the Indians. He is consequently better able to judge of the efficacy of the measures adopted by the Government in dealing with the Indians than the hon. gentleman is. He says :—

“ When beginning to speak of the Metis I was happy to invoke the testimony of Lord Dufferin in their favor. In alluding to the Indians, I am equally pleased to be able to