

from the conduct of this Administration in destroying, in mutilating and in refusing to submit to Parliament the evidences of their own misconduct, that inference is that the Government have something to conceal. The hon. gentleman says that we have all the papers before us that are necessary to form an opinion on this subject, and he refers to the discussions which took place last year, and the papers which were then before Parliament. Why, does not the hon. gentleman know that what we are now discussing is a entirely different question from that which we were discussing last year? We were then discussing the question of the grievances of the half-breeds, and then, as now, in every movement we made we were crippled by the action of the Administration. They refused then to produce the papers, and my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), day after day, week after week, and month after month, made motion upon motion, and besought the Administration to bring down papers upon which to form an opinion; but the Government delayed until the closing hour of the Session, and the documents upon which to form an opinion had not been printed by Parliament. So it is now. Documents are required to judge of the conduct of the Administration, to form a clear opinion upon their conduct, have many of them been suppressed. Fortunately, in the papers submitted to Parliament last Session, in those brought down this Session, and from other sources, we have sufficient to justify any reasonable man in coming to the conclusion that the conduct of this Administration, from the beginning to the end—from the outbreak to the closing of the rebellion, to the closing scene at Regina, was such as to deserve the condemnation of this country. The hon. gentleman asks, are we prepared to justify a rebellion? We do not pretend to justify the rebellion; but we say that the responsibility for the rebellion, with all its consequences—the loss of life, the shedding of human blood, the ruin and desolation of the homes of the half-breeds,—rests on the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite; and they know it. Why, Sir, one of their own officials says—and they will find it in the last report of the Department—that the Indians of the North-West were forced to join the rebels because they were starved; and yet we are told that the conduct of the Government prior to the rebellion has been fair and honest conduct. The Minister of Public Works, when he undertook to defend the Government, two or three days ago, stated, candidly enough I suppose, that he desired that this should be a fair, an open, a full discussion—that the Government had nothing to conceal, that they desired to disclose everything, and that he was delighted to have the opportunity of meeting his accusers face to face; but the hon. gentleman has taken good care not to submit to Parliament the very documents on which hon. members may be enabled to form an opinion on this case. In a pamphlet that has been scattered broadcast throughout the Dominion, printed at a printing office owned by a member of Parliament, they have set forth some of the petitions against the execution of Louis Riel. If they publish the petitions against the execution of Louis Riel, is there any reason why they should not publish those in favor of that execution? we know that there were petitions, letters, telegrams, insisting on the Government carrying out the law, and yet not a single one of those documents is submitted to Parliament. The Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Militia, and the Minister of Inland Revenue knew perfectly well the influences that were brought to bear on the Administration, to induce them to let the law take its course with respect to Louis Riel; and yet not a single one of the documents showing that influence has been submitted to Parliament. Is it pretended that any of those resolutions and other documents I read to the House, asking the Government to let the law take its course, threatening them with the loss of support if they did not do so, and directing that copies should be sent to Sir John Macdonald,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.)

have not been submitted to the Government? and if they have been, I say Parliament ought to be put in possession of them. The hon. gentleman tells us we have all the documents we require. Have we the reasons why the Crown did not proceed with the prosecution against Jackson? We know, as a matter of fact, that the counsel for the Crown in that case declined to proceed; we believe that the Government so directed him; and if that is so, we ought to have the instructions which were given to the Crown counsel on that subject. We also know that the First Minister charged that the rebellion was caused by the conduct of the white settlers. If so, why were the white settlers not prosecuted? I am told the report as to that is not down yet. And hon. gentlemen see fit to force on this discussion in the absence of all these documents. We know that Father McWilliams wrote a letter to a high official in this country; we believe the Government are in possession of that letter. Why is it not produced? Now, Sir, I am not very much surprised at the conduct of this Administration, as a general rule; but I am a little surprised at the course of the Minister of Justice. He was a judge; he has only lately descended from the Bench and laid aside the ermine, to enter the political arena. When he was a judge, I know from report that he held the scales of justice in an honest hand. But evil communications corrupt good manners, and the moment he gets beside his colleagues he lays aside the impartiality that he exercised as a judge. I ask him if, when he was a judge, a criminal were brought before him, and the Crown counsel had suppressed and concealed or mutilated one-half of the evidence, what would he, holding the scale of justice, have said, of such conduct on the part of the Crown prosecutor? He would probably have recommended the Law Society to strike his name off the roll. On the other hand, suppose he was trying a prisoner, and one-half of the evidence that would exculpate him and relieve him from the punishment that he would receive, if convicted, were suppressed by the Crown prosecutor, would the Minister of Justice have forced on the trial? Not at all; he would not have allowed the case to go on until the matter was fairly and honestly placed before the court. But when he becomes a politician he acts in a different sense. He is quite willing now that a verdict should be given by this House with one-half of the evidence before it. Why? Because his colleagues are the offenders, and are now on their trial before the people of this country. The hon. gentleman tells us we have all the papers. Where are the papers moved for by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot)? He had four or five motions on the Notice paper. Those motions were passed by this House and assented to by the Government; and yet scarcely a single document that he asked for have the Government seen fit to bring down. I myself have submitted motions for documents of the first consequence to enable us to decide this case, but they have not been brought down. What has become of the diary of Louis Riel, which I believe would throw a flood of light on the conduct of the Administration, and very likely on the question of the sanity or insanity of Riel? The Government have these papers in their hands, and yet the Minister of the Interior tells us with his usual composure that we have all the papers we require to enable us to form a judgment on this case. What has become of the minute book containing the Order in Council of the insurgents' council? Is that not of essential consequence to the forming of a fair and reasonable opinion on this case? So far as I am concerned, I said, when I addressed myself to this question, that I felt embarrassed because these documents were not submitted to the House. It is true, we have the judge's charge; but who has seen it? The truth of the matter is, the Government are afraid to produce these documents—afraid of the consequences of their production—afraid that this country will condemn them on their production: and they refuse to pro-