

clergymen said they had been misled, and he could not know that certain agents of the Dominion Government had found that information supplied to them by others was not correct; so that, when he is called an Ananias, and is told that he is a liar, hon. gentlemen ought to be prepared to show, from the evidence which was before him, which was the only evidence that he could use—that their allegation is true. That is the only fair and honourable course to be taken towards any political opponent. Let the House see how unfair it was. Mr. Blake replied to Sir John Macdonald, and said:

"We will all be anxious to receive the exculpatory or explanatory statement of the hon. gentleman, but why he should not lay the material now on the Table before publishing it, since he has the material? The hon. gentleman had the right to make, from the evidence that reached him, what charges he chose, but on examining it we find the evidence altogether fallacious.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must analyze it.

"Some hon. MEMBERS. Let us analyze it,

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must classify it under the different charges. You shall get the whole of the evidence: I can assure you of that. I shall have it carefully prepared in narrative form and distribute copies to every member, besides furnishing copies to the constituencies."

The House recognized at that time that it was essential that it should have the opportunity of seeing these outside statements which had been received by the Government and upon which the Government based the pamphlet they issued. That information was denied to the House. The House did not see it. If the House had seen it, if the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) had seen it and had found that it explained the statements which were before Parliament, it would be different, but nothing of this information was before that hon. member when he made these charges, and I think it was not unreasonable that, having been defeated at the last election, having been left out of the House, he, as an honourable man—for what honourable man will not smart under unfair charges, besides being stamped by a name which is offensive to any man with a sense of honour—should now, on the first opportunity he has had in Parliament since these charges were levelled against him, taken the opportunity to show that he has been maligned, and that he should call upon the Ministers opposite to admit that they had not done justice to him and to ask them why they acted as they did. If there be a difference of opinion, let there be a difference of opinion; and if we are to have political warfare, let us have honest warfare; and if the member for West Huron did misquote, if he did garble, if he did forge, as I think he was charged with doing, from the blue-books, and it can be shown from the authors that he used, from the utterances of the agents, that he had put words in their mouth that they did not use, then he might be fairly charged with great carelessness, if not worse. But if the members opposite are unable to say to-day that what he did charge is not to be found in the reports of the different agents, they are not justified in stigmatizing him as a man whose word is not to be taken, because some of the agents or other authors, when being asked personally to send in a report, after excitement had been created in this matter, modified their statements so as to say, over their own signatures, that when they made these statements they were misled in the matter. I think the House can see how the matter stands; I think the House, composed of honourable men, will realize that the member for

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

West Huron was perfectly justified in making the vindication of himself which he did make in his speech to-day.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the observations that have been made on the other side of the House are almost a complete vindication of the course pursued by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) in his speech on this question some years ago. It must indeed be very gratifying for the member for West Huron to find that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior now complain, after having spoken on this subject before, after having hurled epithets at that hon. gentleman, that he did not give them an opportunity, that he did not give them time, that he did not give them notice. They had already spoken on this question, they had gone before the people, behind the back of the member for West Huron, and had pronounced upon his conduct and upon his course in reference to this subject. The member for West Huron made an elaborate speech on this occasion, a speech carefully prepared from the documents published by the Government, and out of their own mouths he has established the truth of the allegations that he made against the Government. He has also the satisfaction of knowing that the members of the Government complain that they have forgotten the charges they made against him, that they are a continuation, as it were, of the matters treated in their reports, and they plead for mercy now, after having gone from one end of this country to the other and scattered these reports against the member for West Huron, and after having loaded him with all sorts of opprobrious epithets, they now come humbly, almost apologizing to this hon. gentleman for having done so. It must be a great gratification to the member for West Huron to have this vindication from the gentlemen who maligned him on that occasion. Now, I notice in this book that was published at that time by the department—I have only had a little time to look into it, but I notice that there are some things in this book that should not be there; I notice things concerning the Indians that I do not think it is the duty of the department to put in a book at all. For instance, I find on page 30 a statement that the Indians have a chronic habit of grumbling. Now, what good can this possibly do? Is it by such a policy that the Government are going to conciliate the Indians—publicly telling the Indians that they are in the habit of grumbling? Then the Minister of Justice made a statement to the same effect to-day. Is this going to promote that harmony that should exist between the Indian tribes and the Government of the day? I think the Government are doing something that is calculated, perhaps, to do a greater injury to this country than they are aware of. I think that our Indians should be treated with greater consideration than this, and when they ask for things that are necessary, things that they require, they should not be answered: You are continually grumbling, you are asking for what you have no right to get. This language is calculated to stir up bad feelings on the part of the Indians towards the Government of this country. The Government should be very careful in their dealings with the Indians, and endeavour to consider their feelings and not seek to irritate them, or to create an unpleasant feeling on