

made, when it was proposed to deal with cases, it was found that all the papers in Miller's case, instead of being considered by the Department, and a report made and instructions given to the agent, were still lying in the Department, and, so far as I know, Mr. Miller received no patent for his land up to this moment. I need not go on with other cases. I have a large number of them here, but they are of a similar type of this one of Mr. Miller. The people complain of the reservations at Regina and in other parts of the country. They complain of the reservation of the one mile belt, and a good indication of the state of the country is shown by the fact that a newspaper, the *Prince Albert Times*, which generally supported the Government, as small papers in new districts usually do, had an article, when the rumor came, in November, 1883, that the First Minister had resigned, as Minister of Interior, expressing pleasure at the information, and hopes that the new Minister will devote himself to the discharge of his duties, and would be found to be the right man in the right place. In fact, the difficulties complained of by the people of Prince Albert, and the impediments standing in the way of granting their patents, were trifling in their character, though extremely injurious in their effects; they were such as might be remedied by any Minister in five minutes. There was no difficulty, no wrong being done by meeting the wishes of the settlers; on the contrary, it was carrying out the policy of the law to have given the people what they asked. Why was the period of three years' residence, before granting a homestead, required? Merely as an evidence of a *bona fide* intention to occupy the land. Well, if the party has occupied it three years before it is surveyed, and he asks, when it is surveyed, that the Government should give him his patent, what reason is there for withholding it? Are not the three years he has been on the land as good an evidence of his intention of remaining there as if the three years were put in at a later time? There were men who had been on their land for ten years. They were laying out villages and towns. They wanted capital, but the opportunity for obtaining it was denied them, because the Government refused to discharge their duties. I say, a more extraordinary case of—I will not say utter imbecility, but of utter neglect—I never knew in any public office. There is no justification for the treatment the people of Prince Albert and other places in that district received at the hands of the Administration. They were neglected; they were irritated; they had impediments put in the way of their improvements; their business was brought to stagnation by the failure of the Government to discharge the ordinary duties that devolved upon them. The state of things is easily traced. It began in the year 1879, with expressions of good-will towards the Government, in the newspapers. We find that complaints arose after a time—not loud nor very strongly put, but still complaints were made. We find that these complaints grew into exasperation; that public meetings were called; and that afterwards there were declarations of distress and discontent on the part of the population against the conduct of the Government. We find these people declaring that the impediments put in the way of settlement had driven away a large number of people and a large amount of capital, and we find the *Edmonton Bulletin*, a small newspaper in the North-West, which was edited by a member of the North-West Council, stating that there was rebellion in Canada, in 1837, to redress grievances, that there was a rebellion in Manitoba in 1870, before the rights of the people could be secured, that even murder had been committed, and that the Government must not be surprised if difficulties occurred in the North-West if this system of neglect and misconduct were continued. The *Prince Albert Times*, in commenting on the declaration of the *Edmonton Bulletin*, said that

"the above, coming from a member of the North-West council, has a ring of the true metal about it, which indicates the temper of the North-West." I say these complaints, these remonstrances, these petitions, these reports of public meetings, these newspaper articles, all came, from time to time, under the attention of the Government. They began in 1881, before the land office was open. It was by these complaints and remonstrances that the land office was opened at Prince Albert, three years after it ought to have been opened. From that hour until the rebellion occurred there have been remonstrances and complaints on the part of the people, and the grievances of which they complain have not been redressed. Their demands are reasonable; they show how very little it would have required on the part of the Government to satisfy those people; yet that little was not done, and the same misgovernment which drove the half-breeds into rebellion, which excited the Indians, has also produced discontent among the white population of the North-West. I do not deem it necessary to go into these details further. I could give a score of cases, in addition to this one case of Miller, if it were necessary; I take that as a type of all, and I say for this conduct there was no excuse; and if this House refuses to affirm the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham, it will be wanting in its duty to the North-West and to the electors who created this Parliament. I say that the cases I have brought under the attention of the House are cases of maladministration. I say that hon. gentlemen opposite have grossly mismanaged the public affairs of this country, and their conduct is properly characterised in the resolution before us. If hon. gentlemen vote against that resolution, they will declare that the white population of the North-West have had nothing to complain of; they will declare that the Government have dealt fairly and justly by the white population and by the half-breed population; they will declare that those people have no grounds of complaint. If they do so, they will vote contrary to the facts available to every member of the House in the papers laid before us.

Mr. ROYAL. A great deal has been said upon this question during the last two days; it has been considered from different points of view, and I believe it is proper for the members from the Province of Manitoba to offer some considerations on the causes, whether remote or immediate, that have led to the troubles which have just come to an end. In a new country, where institutions are new, those institutions are put to a supreme test when a portion of the people rise in arms to enforce some remedy for their grievances. Those grievances may be real or imaginary; but when there is a unanimous feeling among the different portions of the same community to rush to arms in defence of the majesty of the law and the institutions of the country, and to restore peace and order, I believe that in that country, however, young it may be, the institutions are of a lasting nature. In this case, we have seen that the moment there was a call for the people of the old Dominion of Canada to support the majesty of the law, and to enforce the existing connection between all the members of this Dominion, that is to say, between all the Provinces having a common interest in supporting the existence of Canada, the way in which this call was responded to showed that every person and every family in the Dominion of Canada were ready to aid in maintaining the vitality of our institutions. When we have seen the call to arms responded to by the flower of our youth in all the Provinces of the Dominion, I believe that is an evidence that there is an enthusiasm to support the institutions of our country, which is essential to a nationality. And, Sir, from out of these troubles I believe this good will come: They have demonstrated that there is a national spirit in the whole Dominion of Canada. Now