

taine. He, like many others, patriotic men, thought that a people however small in numbers, ought not, and cannot submit to oppression without having first used all constitutional means to defend and preserve their rights. Lafontaine set to work and was not long left alone with the Catholic party. Brave men, true Canadians, sincere patriots, amongst English, Scotch and Irish, rallied around him—Lafontaine and Baldwin fought the battles of their country; the great cause of justice and liberty triumphed in spite of John A. Macdonald, now (through the support we gave him in the past) Sir John A. Macdonald. Lafontaine and Baldwin were called upon to form an administration. With much difficulty they succeeded. The Opposition, of which the present Premier was a member, caused much trouble. A great agitation arose; the Parliament buildings were burned down while the House was in session; Lafontaine was menaced and even besieged in his own private residence; the Governor was publicly insulted, and other outrages were perpetrated, but fanaticism failed. The mass of the people, English, Scotch and Irish, united with the French against those unpatriotic men. Peace was restored; *Justitia et pax oscula-tae sunt*; each nationality in Canada had its fair share of influence; our people were quite satisfied with their lot and found at last that they could work hand in hand with their fellow citizens of all other nationalities. Then our country prospered.

We ask for no more to-day. Give us that to which we are entitled—equal rights, equal justice. Then will we have peace and, with peace, prosperity.

It is in the face of all these facts and in view of the parting advice of the great friend of Canada, Sir G. E. Cartier, going to his rest, that the hon. Senators from Lauzon (Mr. Bolduc) and Manitoba (Mr. Girard) have assumed the responsibility of criticising those independent and patriotic men who, after having been true to Sir George during his lifetime, are now following his parting advice, setting aside all personal interests, and undertaking to avert from their compatriots the many dangers which Cartier made known to them.

True the hon. senator from Manitoba

has told us that the agitation would injure him personally, that it would do more harm than good to the part of the country in which he lives, and where he has the greatest part of his property. But this only shows how private interests may blind a man, and induce him to narrow the great and most important question of religious and political liberty to the small limits of the material interest of a section of the country in which he is interested.

The hon. senator's speech showed throughout that his lips did not speak the sentiments of his heart—that his patriotism inspired him one way while his personal interest prompted him to speak in the other direction. Did he not acknowledge that the Government had been the cause of the trouble? But he claimed that this could not justify the rebellion. That is quite true, but circumstances tend to condone the offence. No doubt both Divine and human laws make the taking up of arms against legitimate authority a very serious crime. But the same laws make it also an equally grave sin to provoke by injustice another to commit a crime. How then could he draw the conclusion that he does not see any sufficient reason to refuse to support and have confidence in the government of the day who are the parties, according to his own admission and many public documents, who forced those people into rebellion? If that is so, by what logical argument can the hon. gentleman show that the Government, having the power of mercy and not having exercised it, are anything short of murderers of Riel, and responsible for over 200 lives lost during these troubles?

Then the hon. gentleman from Manitoba read two or three letters from parties in the West. What do they show? The weakness of the case of the Government and nothing else. In one of those letters the writer charges the agitators with excusing the rebellion. I defy the hon. gentleman to name a single speaker who has done so. I defy him to name a single newspaper on our side which has published anything of the kind. They said that the rebels were wrong; that both the law of God and the law of man make it a crime to rise in arms against constituted authority; but they also said, as they say now, that the authors of the rebellion were those who, by their unjust dealings