

Here is the answer, dated 2nd April, 1872 :

"I have your note with the extract from the letter of Mr. Henry Woodington. It appears Mr. Woodington desires funds to be provided, not exceeding \$3,000 for an effort which he proposes to make to procure the trial of some of the murderers of Scott. You will observe that a reward of \$5,000 has been offered to any person who is instrumental in accomplishing that result."

Then further down :

"In my private capacity I should be very glad."

Mr. BLAKE. Read it all.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It is rather long.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it is not long.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will do so, and can further show the hon. gentleman that under the judgment of Chief Justice Wood, he held that for any money that had been advanced, any work that had been done, the parties were to be recouped, and that that \$5,000 was to be given to every Tom, Dick and Harry, whichever happened to see Riel. I will also give him a list of the men to whom it was paid. The following is the remainder of the hon. gentleman's letter :

"It is presumed that the magnitude of the reward would induce those who are able to accomplish it to undertake the work. I have already stated to you that I have received applications from other persons who are desirous to obtain funds for the indicated purpose, and I have been obliged to answer these applications in the same way. I also pointed out to you the possible consequences of so disbursing the public money, inasmuch as it would be out of the question to ensure any result, and numerous applications might be made involving considerable expenses to no good purpose."

Then follows the paragraph that I commenced reading :

"In my private capacity I should be very glad to become a subscriber to any fund for the purpose of accomplishing the indicated object, but, as I have mentioned above, we have no public moneys which we are authorised to dispose of in that way."

Now, that is most of the correspondence that can be found with regard to parties who desired assistance in order to capture Riel; and that is the record of the hon. gentleman who promised action. It will be remembered that Archbishop Taché published a book in 1874, after the change of Government, in which he endeavored to prove that an amnesty was promised. The organ of the Liberal party, the *Globe* of the 19th March, 1874, said :

"The men who could speak with authority on the subject are still alive, and are still accessible; Lord Lisgar is not beyond reach. Why, if such a promise were given, has he never been referred to, and never asked to state what he knows of the subject? Lord Lisgar is a man of too lofty an integrity and too independent a position to shrink from stating what he knows on the subject. Yet no recourse has been had to him; and, so far as the public is aware, not the slightest effort made to secure his testimony. Sir Clinton Murdoch, whose name has been freely used in this connection, is also perfectly within reach. He is not a man to shrink from avowing what he has said or done. Has there been any attempt made to secure his version of the matter? If not, why not? And there is Sir John Macdonald himself. His late colleague in the Ministry, Governor Morris, has most solemnly declared that he, during all the time he held a portfolio, knew nothing of such a promise or such an amnesty. Why, then, not refer to Sir John himself? We are told that he is the soul of honor, and he is bound by no official oath to conceal such a transaction."

Then, after the Revd. gentlemen's pamphlet was issued, the *Globe*, on the 9th April, 1874, said :

"The reader cannot fail to have observed: (1.) That no direct proof of any kind can apparently be brought forward to prove the promise of amnesty. (2.) That four years having elapsed, and Archbishop Taché being well informed on the subject, is almost conclusive against the existence of any such proof. (3.) That the proof relied on is hearsay evidence of the most unreliable kind—documents anterior to the crucial circumstance, and inferences from conversations which so far as they are reported, makes against the amnesty theory. As we have said, the difficulty of proving it, the necessity of elaboration, and of having recourse to inadmissible evidence, furnish a strong presumptive case against the theory of a promise being made. How is it there is a record of everything else, and no reliable record of such a promise! The matter may be regarded now as settled, and Riel's friends must take up some other stand than that he is an amnestied man."

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman said last night that the venerable Archbishop Taché, upon his oath, swore that the amnesty was promised. Allow me to refer to the evidence given by that distinguished prelate before the North-West committee in 1874:—

"The only reason for delaying the granting of the amnesty promised by the proclamation of Sir John Young, that I am aware of, has been the excitement existing throughout the Dominion, and especially in the Province of Ontario. This is not merely my own opinion; it is also the opinion expressed to me by certain members of the late Government. The constant reply which I received when I spoke to them on the subject was, that the excitement was so great that the Government would not be sustained if the amnesty was given. I spoke first of all to Sir

George Cartier on the subject, I then spoke to Sir John A. Macdonald, and subsequently to Mr. Langevin. I also spoke on the subject to other members of the Government, but not so minutely, because I was not brought so closely in contact with them. The reply I have quoted was that given me by each member of the Government when I spoke to them."

"In the conversations I had with those gentlemen, I always understood that the amnesty was to be a full, complete and entire one. I never had any conversation on the subject of a partial Manitoba amnesty, under that proclamation. I have had a communication relative to a partial amnesty, but that was not until the year 1873. That communication was with Sir John A. Macdonald, and it was made verbally, not in writing."

Now with regard to the amnesty, a proclamation dated December, 1869, and signed by the Governor General, Sir John Young, was issued in this language :

"And I do lastly inform you that in case of your immediate and peaceable obedience and dispersion, I shall order that no legal proceedings be taken against any parties implicated in these unfortunate breaches of the law."

Added to this, permit me to read an extract from a letter written to Lieut.-Governor Archibald by Archbishop Taché in June, 1870 :

"ST. BONIFACE,
"RED RIVER SETTLEMENT,
"9th June, 1870."

"Hon. JOSEPH HOWE,
"Secretary of State for the Provinces,
"Ottawa, Canada."

"HONORABLE SIR,—I hasten to communicate to you, for the information of His Excellency in Council, a very important promise I have just made in the name of the Canadian Government. I feel all the responsibility I have incurred in taking such a step, while on another hand I am confident that His Excellency the Governor General and his Privy Council will not judge with too much severity an act accomplished in order to avoid great misfortunes and secure the welfare of the country."

Well, the hon. gentleman, as I have shown, has not proved and cannot prove that Archbishop Taché swore that an amnesty had been promised to Riel, after the murder of Thomas Scott was known. However, as a consensus of evidence generally prevails, I will now read the evidence upon that subject. Lord Lisgar wrote to Sir George Cartier early in 1873 :

"I have in recollection the interview which I had with the Reverend Abbé Ritchot upon your introduction and in your presence.

"He dwelt earnestly upon two points :

"First. The redress of the political grievances of the inhabitants of the Red River settlement, with a special reference, as I understood, to land grants."

"Second. On an assurance of the exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy to cover all offences."

"I promised to forward, without delay, the petition he speaks of as in preparation, and stated that I felt sure Her Majesty's Government would give full and serious consideration to any pleas which might be urged on behalf of the view he advocated."

"I am quite clear that neither on the occasion in question, nor on any other, did I give an assurance or promise of an amnesty to cover all the offences committed during the insurrection."

"LISGAR."

Here is another from Sir Clinton Murdoch, formerly of the Governor's staff :

"I have no recollection of any promise or expectation of an amnesty to Riel and his associates having been held out by Lord Lisgar, when Mr. Ritchot had an interview with him, in my presence, or at any other time. I scarcely think if such a promise had been made, I could have failed to notice it at the time or to collect it now. As regards Sir George Cartier, I do not remember having ever had any conversation with him on the subject, or being present at any interview when it was discussed between him and Lord Lisgar."

Sir George E. Cartier wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald on the 8th February, 1873 :

"The only thing I can do to-day is to acknowledge the receipt of your last, of the 22nd January, about "Riel" matter.

"I hear Lord Lisgar is to be here in a few days, and I will hasten to see him about what passed at the interview with Father Ritchot. To the best of my recollection nothing went beyond stating that he would transmit Ritchot's petition to the Queen, praying for an amnesty. Bear in mind that oath of us stated to Father Ritchot that the amnesty was a question for the Queen, not for our Government."

Then we have the testimony of Sir Hector Langevin, then Mr. Langevin, on this subject :

"The proclamation of amnesty, dated December 8th, 1869, was issued long before the death of Thomas Scott, and when so issued, it certainly did not contemplate anything else than the legal acts that had been committed up to the time of its issue."

"The causes that have delayed the granting of an amnesty in accordance with the proclamation were, first: that circumstances were altogether changed when the death of Thomas Scott occurred. I am not aware of any promise or any amnesty having been made by the Government of Canada further than that contained in the proclamation of 8th December, 1869, or of any promise by any member of the Government on behalf of the Government."

Sir John A. Macdonald also swore that no such amnesty was promised, and this is potently established by a letter.