

men, and one of his own faith: \$5,000 was offered for this traitor and murderer, and it never was paid. Riel came down to Ottawa and took the oath as a good and loyal subject of Her Majesty; and he had a right to come and take his seat. But I do not think the present Government countenanced Riel. I think it was not this Government that brought him here. But I had made a speech, it appears, at Peterboro', saying that I wished to God we could catch Riel. There never was a prayer more sincerely offered than that which I uttered at that time. If we had got Riel then, he would have been brought and tried in the Province of Ontario or in Quebec. We have got a special statute, under which such criminals can be tried, and he would have been tried and found guilty. But he could not be tried were the jury was *particeps criminis*, his fellow soldiers who had fought under him; if he had been brought down here we would have got a conviction against him, and the consequence of conviction would have followed. I was, therefore, very anxious to catch him. But the hon. gentleman made unwittingly a misstatement of the facts, when he said that we asked Archbishop Taché to bribe him to leave the country. That was not the case. We tried to arrest him, and the hon. gentleman sought to help us by offering the reward. But it was offered so loudly, it was trumpeted abroad so strongly, that the man ran away.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. members may laugh. The man was in the United States; he was living under the security which he obtained under the American flag. It was of primary importance—it was of the utmost importance—that he should no longer be a disturbing quantity. We could not catch him; the American Government would not surrender him, though he had committed murder, because it was a political offence. His sympathisers crossed the lines to him and kept hatching fresh troubles. Then, in the interests of peace and of this country—and if the same thing should happen now, I would do it again—I asked Archbishop Taché to see that man with whom he had some influence, and induce him to go away to a distant part—to California or any where, some distance from the frontier—and cease to agitate the country, and allow us to settle the North-West and make it what it has since become, a scene of peace and order. We asked Archbishop Taché to get Riel to go away, and we said we would pay his expenses for one year. I ask the House whether that was not good policy; I ask if that was not practical statesmanship? He went away, and the country has grown to its present position, which it would have never done if Riel had remained on the frontier still agitating, still arousing and still inciting those misguided people who had faith in him. I say I was justified, in the interests of the country, in the interests of peace, in the interests of the great future of the North-West. What I did in that respect was for the purpose of promoting the interests of that country; whatever the hon. gentleman did in that respect was for the purpose of setting race against race, religion against religion. I leave it to this House, and I leave it to the sober judgment of this country, when this subject is carefully looked into, whether it will not be said that what I did was done to promote peace and prosperity; whereas, every action of the hon. gentleman, from the time he offered the \$5,000 and made those incendiary speeches in the House of Assembly, at Toronto, up to this moment, and the equally incendiary motion he has made, and supported by an incendiary speech, I am willing that our actions should be compared. With respect to this motion, I will say that in the interests of the country, I will bring down just such information as I think will best conduce to the settlement of the question as it now stands, and I will not, unless I am compelled by a

vote of this House, which, of course, I must obey with all humility, be forced prematurely to make one single statement that will have a tendency, in my opinion, to postpone, for one single day, the settlement of that country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the pleasure of sitting in this House for any length of time with the First Minister, are tolerably well aware that the justice of his cause is always in inverse ratio to the violence of his declamation. When the First Minister has a good, straightforward case, he is, as a lawyer of his position should be, always able to place it before the House in a quiet, intelligent and reasonable manner. When, on the other hand, the First Minister knows that his conduct has been utterly indefensible, then we have an exhibition such as that which we have lately witnessed. We have every unworthy taunt, every unjust insinuation, every calumny and sneer that his imagination can think of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If hon. gentlemen did not hear me, I will repeat it. We have all these things hurled against men who dare to bring him to account, and invariably we are told that criticism of the conduct of the Government of the day means want of patriotism to our country. That is the invariable refrain which rings from those benches. They may do what they please; they may drive the people to revolt; they may plunder the people in every imaginable way; but if one word of condemnation comes from these benches, we are unpatriotic, because it does not suit their high mightinesses that their conduct should be criticised. I regret exceedingly that this thing should have occurred. I believe, as the leader of the Opposition and the First Minister says, this occurrence is going to do a very considerable amount of mischief to the future of this country, and I regret that, for every possible reason. But I put it to the common sense of the House and of the people of this country, is there to-day one newspaper, from one end of Canada to the other, which is not filled with accounts of the disturbance in the North-West? Are not these things already known from one end of North America to the other? Have we not had the statement of the First Minister himself, that before he knew it, and let the House mark the words, these things were made public in England and in the English press; and, Sir, these things being known, these things being of common record, these things being in the highest sense public property, is the only place in all North America where this matter is not to be discussed the Parliament of Canada? That, Sir, is the position which the hon. the First Minister has taken. Sir, I say there is no sense, no expediency in that position. I say it is infinitely better that it should go forth that the members of this House are unanimously in favor of upholding law, that we are disposed to assist the Government in putting down armed revolt or riot, or whatever you may choose to call it, but that at the same time they should declare they are willing to redress all just grievances; and that they, the great inquest of the nation, are prepared to make examination into the causes which are alleged to have brought about this unfortunate occurrence. Now, I call the attention of the House to this: That the leader of the Opposition has shown clearly and distinctly that, year by year, through a whole series of years, it has been known that these people were discontented, that the Government have had ample warning, ample opportunity to remedy these wrongs. Why, Sir, I recollect myself—and I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) can bear testimony, too—that in 1878, about the time we went out of office, these men were making complaints, and my hon. friend then found it necessary to take special precautions and measures to allay