

of the Indians go on, as he is putting them on the reserves, the danger increases; the statements that as the white settlers increase in numbers, the number of the Mounted Police must increase, is, from a financial aspect and from other aspects as well, a most alarming and unsatisfactory statement. He says the Mounted Police force has done its duty. Well, that, so far as I know, is a fair statement of the case. I have made no imputation, directly, indirectly, or impliedly, on the conduct of the Mounted Police.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be extremely unreasonable that I should do so, but I recollect such imputations being made from the other side. I recollect the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), some years ago making a series of the strongest imputations against the Mounted Police. He, of course, had the advantage of local knowledge, the advantage of acquaintance with the people in the territory, he had the duty, the responsibility to a very large extent, as the representative of an important constituency, in a certain sense the representative of a somewhat distinct class, of making a statement of what he believed to be true, and in the discharge of his duty he made statements I am sure the House heard with great pain. I have no information which would enable me to say anything on this subject which would be condemnatory of the Mounted Police, and of course I assume, in the absence of such information, there is no cause for condemnation. I am sure some of the hon. gentleman's observations with reference to the requisitions of the Mounted Police and the care to be taken in selection will hardly be in accord with some former observations and with the reports, which, at a subsequent stage, I will have the pleasure of bringing in contrast with his statements to-day. He has said that peace prevailed amongst the Indians. It is not the first time he has made that statement. I will not enter into a discussion of that to-day, but my reading of the official papers does not lead me to that conclusion. I find very strong statements, from 1879 onwards, which lead to the conclusion that his statement is altogether too rose-colored, and as soon as the report emerges from the galley form, if it be a correct report for the year 1884, he will find my observations confirmed, though I have not the advantage of having seen the report, and, therefore, I speak with respect only to other sources of information which are open to him as well as to myself. The hon. gentleman has said that he justifies the enlistment of this force, this House in session, in advance of the authority, because of the urgency of the case, and his knowledge that the House would approve the Act. I maintain that the hon. gentleman, having this resolution on the paper, or having the capacity to put it on the paper long before, as far as we know, he took the first step to enlist a man, long before, as he has told us, he took the first step to enlist a man, was bound to have prosecuted this resolution and to have obtained the sanction and authority of this House before enlisting men in excess of his authority and in defiance of the law. He says: I was satisfied with regard to the emergency, the anticipations of discontent, and so forth, that Parliament, which was then in session, would ratify my Act. I said yesterday, and I repeat to-day, that I would be the last man to accuse a Minister who, under some pressing necessity, acted in excess of his authority and came down to the Parliament and said: I have my political life in my hands, the safety of my country required me to act, and I call upon you for indemnification. That is the course a patriotic statesman would take, that is the risk a patriotic statesman would run. But it is a different thing when action is taken *sedente parlamento*. I say the necessity which justifies that action does not then exist. I say, that, when the authority can be obtained, you have no right to act in defiance of the law, you have no right to exceed the

law. The hon. gentleman has no right to count even upon his majority in this House ratifying what he does in defiance of the law, when this House is sitting. His duty is to invite their attention to his views, to ask them to promote his legislation, to ask them to clothe them with the legal authority to do these things in the interest of the country, which he thinks the good of the country requires. That is his duty, and that call would no doubt be obeyed, but to tell us that he was quite sure that, whatever he did Parliament would ratify, and that, therefore, this Parliament sitting, he acted with perfect confidence in excess of and in defiance of the law, is to make a statement which certainly indicates the hon. gentleman's very great confidence in the submissive character of the majority of this Parliament, but very much less respect for its dignity, its honor and its independence.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not rise to oppose this motion, but I feel that, at a crisis like this, it is well that, before we commit ourselves to a permanent charge upon the country, we should look around and see what it is for and where the necessity exists. I am not going to say one word against the Mounted Police, but there have been a good many statements made about some portions of the Mounted Police that I think should be laid before this House before we undertake to double their number, and to double the charge upon the country. I do not think that the present time is exactly the one to deal with it or discuss it, were it not that we are now asked to increase very seriously the charge upon the country for this particular branch of the service. I am not going to say that 1,000 men are not required in that country in the west, but I feel that, after the very satisfactory manner in which the campaign in that western country has been conducted and the insurrection put down, this Government, strong in the success of their recent efforts in that region, may ask us, and very likely will ask us, and the tendency of the Government under such circumstances is to ask the country, to increase the charges and place more power in their hands, and necessarily increase to the people of the country the taxation which we are not prepared to increase now, if we can avoid it. I am not going to say anything more about the Mounted Police matter, but, in discussing the numbers of the Mounted Police required in that country, we cannot confine the discussion to the Mounted Police alone. We should have laid before us, when we are asked to increase the liability of this country as we are asked to increase it, the whole treatment of the North-West; we should have the whole Indian policy submitted, and we should have this Parliament asked to advise and consult with the Government, to direct the Government what policy should be pursued with reference to the Indian tribes in that country in the future. I am one of those who believe that the arrangements as to the Indian tribes have been most unfortunate, with regard both to the settlement of that country and the future of the Indians themselves. The right hon. gentleman has described to us the condition of the Indians around these Hudson Bay stations and supply stores, and I presume all around the railway stations in that country. I saw somewhat of it myself last year when I was up there. You could scarcely go to a station west of a certain longitude without finding some of these Indians, with their tepees in the neighborhood, loafing around, seeking charity, and living in idleness and misery. If they are to continue in that way in the future, there is very little hope for them or for the country which contains them, for its peace, its prosperity or its advancement. I think the Government, before asking us to increase the charges for the North-West, should consider it their first duty to lay before this Parliament a policy as to the treatment of the Indian tribes in future. We should know whether these tribes, with their reserves located along the great means of