

no benefit. So far as the half-breeds are concerned, we are told that there has been an absolute want of action, and a non-settlement of claims on the part of the Government. Now, I find that in 1883 the land board met at Prince Albert, Mr. Pearce being the leading member of it, and they sat and adjusted a large number of claims. In 1884 Mr. Pearce went to Calgary, Edmonton and Battleford, contrary to the statements made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and which, despite the evidence I am now giving, will probably be repeated by the hon. member for Bothwell. He visited the South Saskatchewan and did a large amount of work, subsequently leaving to Mr. Duck, the agent at Prince Albert, the settlement of claims on the South Saskatchewan—the claims of men who had come there and taken up land and forcibly made settlers of themselves. I think I have shown that so far as patents issued are concerned, want of action and utter indifference were alone shown by the hon. member for Bothwell when he was Minister of the Interior. So far as the duties performed by Mr. Pearce and the land board are concerned, there was rapid and active work, and instead of condemning hon. gentlemen opposite, from their own records, should have been the first to have endorsed it. They appear to forget, too, that their negligence in surveys, in allotments and in locations, allowed years to elapse, thereby making it difficult to find the rightful owners or claimants, and that by annulling Governor Archibald's enumeration they lost several years and completely reversed the policy of their predecessors. But with that party blindness which drove them out of power, and which will keep them out of power for many years, these hon. gentlemen proceed, in the face of evidence that they cannot gainsay, to condemn the present Government as one wanting in action, one neglectful of its duties to the country. The hon. member for West Huron said, where is the Prime Minister, and why is he not present to hear my indictment? And what was the indictment? Was it one which a leading public man should bring against any Government? No, Sir; it was a series of extracts from newspapers, and a denial on the part of the hon. gentleman that he was actuated by any motive save the public interest. When the dates of these papers were asked he took it as a personal affront, and gave the date of only one extract from the *Toronto Mail* of March last. He alluded also to an extract from *La Minerve*. Why, Sir, had the hon. gentleman desired to do so, he could have found in *La Minerve* of the next day an article by the regular editor, manager and controller of that paper, stating that the article to which the hon. gentleman referred was smuggled into the editorial columns of that journal. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, instead of making that statement, omitted these facts. Do these hon. gentlemen imagine that the people of this country are not intelligent? The people had a Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a leading representative, in power from 1873 to 1878, and we know that so far as the Hon. Mr. Laird is concerned, who preceded the hon. member for Bothwell as Minister of the Interior, so soon as that gentleman was found incompetent, was found not to answer just exactly what the Reform party required, as Minister of Interior, he was sent up to formulate and regulate a policy for the great North-West. He was given control over the larger territory and the larger interest, and the hon. member for Bothwell took his place, and I think the hon. gentleman, in his inner consciousness, knows what state that Department was in when he entered it, and how much credit it reflected on his predecessor. If Mr. Laird was competent, if he was an able and brilliant statesman, why did they not keep him in the Government? But, no; they sent him to the North-West, to make treaties with the Indians, and I ask why it was, while he was there, that he did not in

Mr. MACKINTOSH,

those treaties arrange for the allotment and the settlement of those claims. And when the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) talks about the Indians having no rations, about their being badly treated, about their starving, I ask him if in any of the treaties they can find obligations entered into by the then Government, or by any Government controlling the interests of Canada, at that time, promises or engagements to ration those Indians? I ask hon. gentlemen who have moved an amendment in the interests of the half-breeds, and in the interest of their leader, M. Riel, the claimant of 240 acres of land, the claimant of five lots, who says he has many other additional claims to make—I ask if they knew what the policy of Riel was. If they did not know, they should not have introduced that resolution, because I think those gentlemen have read the records, they know the history of the uprising, and they have taken far more interest in knowing more of him and those connected with him than they have with regard to the interests of the Dominion at large. I find that Riel, writing to Bishop Grandin, at the time when he pretended to be acting in the interests of peace and harmony and constitutional government, treating this Government as a child should its father, said:

"Here is what we request for the present until Canada becomes able to pay each year the interest on the capital representing the value of our country, and until public opinion consents to recognise our rights to the land, to their full extent."

I ask hon. gentlemen to weigh this evidence, this statement, and see what it means. They know what they did for Riel in 1874. We know now what they are trying to do for him. They are trying to cloak the wrong-doing of that agitator by a vote of Parliament, though I do not assert they are doing it with a rebellious thought or feeling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes; they are.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. But I know that party passion has misled them, that it is carrying them to an extent they will much regret in the future, when they come to meet the people at the polls; and what has the result been? Does Riel say to that distinguished prelate of his church: Give us these rights; give us responsible government; give us our land, and we will be satisfied. No; he says we are willing to take that for the present only, until public opinion consents to recognise our rights to the land to the full extent. What does that mean? It means that any compromise with those people now would mean future trouble and misery in the North-West. Even with the heads of the Church, Riel was mysterious, as proved by Bishop Grandin's words at the meeting in September last, when that dignitary made a speech as follows:—

"The venerable prelate said that if for some time past the relations between the clergy and the half-breed population with regard to what had taken place appeared cold and unsympathetic, that reserve on the part of the clergy did not argue any diminution of affection or charity, but was simply actuated by the extreme prudence which the actual circumstances demanded on account of the mystery in which they (the half-breeds) had thought proper to envelop their proceedings up to that day—a mystery which not only left the clergy without sufficient knowledge on which to base a clear and well-founded judgement, but which, moreover, gave rise to serious suspicions, to fears and disquietudes that were absolutely painful. 'Only speak out honestly,' added his Lordship; 'only let us know distinctly what your desires and aims are, and we will give you our opinion and counsel. If justice is on your side, we will sustain you with all our strength and influence, as we have ever done in like circumstances in the past.'"

Louis Riel is no common man; he knows the instincts of his people; he knows what control he has over them; and he knew, when he wrote letters to different respectable people, that if he was paid a certain amount of money he would go out of the country and the trouble would cease, that at some future time he could come back, and bring misery and tribulation and depression upon the North-West. But we find hon. gentlemen opposite willing to endorse Riel's policy and Riel's duplicity. Now, the hon. gentle-