

treatment in that region. That may be so. I have no doubt that in that corps, as in every corps of the same kind, the same as in the Queen's troops, the regiments of the line, there will be immorality; and if any cases of that kind were brought under the notice of the Government in such a way as to make them proper subjects of investigation, I have no doubt that they would be investigated. But the hon. gentleman should not forget that the same state of things existed in these vast territories long before our time. If you look at one of the books of Sir George Simpson you will find that he states that at that period there was immorality amongst the Indians, and when you find that immorality exists in the centres of civilisation, how can you suppose, that amongst these savages, no immorality will be found? But he charges all that to the Mounted Police or the officials of the Government. I think it is very unfair that this charge should go abroad without contradiction or protest. But the hon. gentleman says that we, the Government, were all responsible for this; if a policeman or an official misbehaves himself as a private individual, he holds us responsible for that. Well, I must decline that responsibility. That soldier or that official, if he misbehaves himself as a private individual, must be personally held responsible for that; we have nothing to do with his personal conduct so long as it does not interfere with his official duties. But the hon. gentleman while so speaking, all at once perceived that the charges he was making might produce some effect in the North-West; and he exclaimed all at once: I would not be surprised if, at this very moment, we are on a volcano. The hon. gentleman should have reflected a little before he began his speech, and made these charges and tried to excite the Indians in the North-West. He should have remembered that an appeal having been made to these Indians by Riel, last year, produced the unfortunate insurrection which we all so much deplore; and these appeals of the hon. gentleman and these charges against the Government that we are culpable, that we have allowed the Indians to starve and to be frozen to death—these appeals are not calculated to keep the Indians quiet and to make them law-abiding citizens of the country. On the contrary, they are calculated to make these men feel that we must expend much larger sums of money in order to feed them, from the first day to the last day of the year—that they need not work—that we need not take any means to compel them to stay on their reserves. No; the hon. gentleman says, you must not diminish their rations; they must be fed as if they were working; though by reducing their rations you compel them to go on their reserves. How will you compel them to go on their reserves if you do not use some means of that kind? If they see that the Government are feeding them all the time, they will never go on their reserves or become civilised enough to work and to cultivate the soil, while the country will be obliged every year to spend millions of money to maintain them. I say that the policy of the Government, in compelling the Indians to go to their reserves is a proper policy. If you do not, by means of their rations, compel them to go on their reserves, how will you get them there? Will you send the volunteers of the country up to drive them on their reserves? No, that cannot be the desire of this House or of the country. Our desire is to treat the Indians well, to give them as much as is necessary to keep them from starvation, and to make them strong enough to work; but they must work and the sooner they understand that the Government will not keep them unless they go on their reserves and work, the better for them and for us. The hon. gentleman says that the hunting having failed, the Indians have been obliged at certain places to sell their horses, and are miserably poor. At another place, he says, they have been obliged to give large sums of money for cattle and implements. Well, the hunting grounds having failed them the Indians had to

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

sell their horses, and I suppose the Government seeing that they had no horses had to give them others. With regard to their oxen, too, they worked on their land for a while, and then they killed their own oxen for food. The result has been that the Government had to expend another large sum of money to provide them with new cattle and new horses, and therefore it is not surprising that our Indian expenditure in the North-West should be so large. I do not say that there is not some abuse; most likely there is; it cannot be otherwise; but the moment the Government lay their hands on an abuse, the moment they see that they are cheated and that the money is not properly expended, of course the Government applies a remedy, and sees that the money goes to the proper object for which it is voted. I am not here to say there have been no abuses; I have no doubt there have been some; and if a charge were brought against a particular official, we would be prepared to put that official on trial and see whether he was guilty or not. But to make a charge, as some of the newspapers do, by saying that everybody says so, that the Indians are suffering, is unfair. But let it be stated that such a band was suffering on such a day, or that the missionary visited the band and found that it was so, and then the Government will be in a position to investigate the case, and would do so. The hon. gentleman also says—and it is a most odious charge against the Government—that the policy of the First Minister, the head of that Department, is one of starving the Indians—that we adopted that policy six years ago, and that it was followed by the Agent General of Indian Affairs, he meant the Superintendent of Indian Affairs. The hon. gentleman knows that this is a charge that has no foundation in fact. He knows perfectly well that the First Minister is not a man to act cruelly towards the Indians. The First Minister has never shown any such propensity or desire. He has always shown the greatest care towards the Indians, and has taken their part on every possible occasion. When he saw that Parliament had not given him the necessary funds and that a larger sum was required during the recess, he did not hesitate to ask for the Governor General's warrant for the balance, though it was a large sum, and then come down to Parliament and state that the sum voted was not enough, that the Indians were starving, that their wants were greater than we had foreseen, and that we had to come to their relief to the tune of \$200,000 or \$300,000 or \$400,000; and Parliament assented to it, because Parliament had the same desire as the First Minister, that is, to relieve the Indians and try to prevent them from starving. The hon. gentleman charged us with being extravagant, with having mismanaged affairs, and with having shown incapacity and culpable neglect. Well, I deny these charges; I deny them on the part of my absent colleague and leader, the First Minister. I deny them on behalf of the other Ministers, his colleagues, and myself, and I do not think my denial will be disallowed by those in whose name I refuse to admit these charges of the hon. gentlemen. I say I repel these charges on behalf of the Conservative party in this House; I say the hon. gentleman will not persuade the country to believe that this Government, which the people have supported for the last eight years and which they intend supporting for another eight years, is an extravagant Government. If we have been extravagant, hon. gentlemen opposite are as guilty as we, because they never charged us with extravagance before this evening. They charge us with mismanagement of Indian affairs. The hon. gentleman has worked for the last five or six weeks, ransacking all the blue books he could find, selecting special items from them and bringing them together, clubbing together three, four or five years of items carefully selected out of the immense sums that have been expended by the Government. I have no doubt that if we took the Public Accounts for the five years, when hon. gentlemen opposite