

"I have no objection to answer the question put by my rev. friend. I do not condemn the Government for the execution of Louis Riel. My condemnation rests on a very much broader and deeper ground—on the ground of their maladministration of the North-West during the past seven years; the other question if I recollect aright was whether the first rebellion in 1870 was justified. * * * The condemnation is asked for on the ground of their general mismanagement, not, so far as I am concerned, on account of the sentence of death being carried into execution. As to the first rebellion in 1870 I am not so well informed on that, but I believe that the universal opinion now among those who have examined the matter, is that the population of the North-West were badly treated in 1870. But to say that rebellion is justified is a very different thing. A rebellion may be excused, and parties who goad unfortunate ignorant men into rebellion may be punished. But that is a wholly different thing from justifying rebellion, and least of all can I undertake to justify rebellion in an Indian country, where, as I have said, an enormous number of our countrymen and countrywomen would have been exposed to all the horrors of savage war if that rebellion had spread."

That was the opinion of the hon. member for South Huron, in contrast with the opinion of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), who a few weeks before had said he would, had he lived on the banks of the Saskatchewan, have shouldered his musket; and possibly the result would have been that the hon. member for South Huron would have had one son less. During this debate we have heard the *Montreal Post* quoted. That paper has condemned the Government for hanging Louis Riel, and published bitter diatribes against the Minister of Inland Revenue and against the Conservative party. When we examine the articles and know who the writer is—that he is a gentleman who failed to obtain a commission from General Middleton, and was yet so anxious to shoot down the half-breeds that he took his gun and went as a volunteer and fought at Batoche, we can understand that there are white grievances at the bottom of half the agitation. Hon. gentlemen opposite have challenged us to show where they used this question in Ontario to stir the people. I will tell them one place. I was in East Durham in August last, and the whole battle on nomination day was fought over the question as to whether Riel should or should not be hanged. An ex-member of the House, Mr. Kerr, of Cobourg, was there stating from the platform that it was the duty of the electors of East Durham to vote for the Government candidate as a warning to them that if they did not hang Riel in September, what the result would be at the next elections. I heard these declarations made on the platform by Mr. Kerr, an ex-member of this House, and a Reformer. He stated further that he condemned Sir John Macdonald for his actions in the House towards Riel, that it brought the blush of shame to his face to find that the Conservative party had supported him, and I turned to the journals and showed that Mr. Kerr himself had given his vote in favor of the very motion for which he was denouncing the leader of the Conservative party. More than that, advertisements were scattered over the riding, offering to devote \$500 to a charitable institution should Louis Riel be hanged if some prominent Conservative would undertake to contribute a like sum in the event of Louis Riel not being hanged. We had some fifteen or sixteen gentlemen in that riding, of whom eight or ten were Liberal members of this House, and our candidate had a majority of between 300 and 400, and, as one gentleman remarked, if we had had the whole of the Reform party in this House in the riding at the time, the majority would have been at least 1000. As for the hon. member for East Quebec, I cannot believe that he spoke the sincere sentiments of his heart when apologising for rebellion; I believe he spoke under excitement, or else he has changed very much since the days when he was in the Ministry, the days when he made loyal speeches to his countrymen and recorded the sentiments embodied in speeches which I have in my possession. I have here a "Lecture on Political Liberalism, delivered by Wilfred Laurier, M. P., on the 26th of June, 1877, in the Music Hall, Quebec, under the auspices of the Canadian Club." In that speech he said:

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

"You wish to organise a Catholic party, but have not taken into consideration the evil of raising it; you will bring on your country calamities, the consequences of which it is impossible to predict."

"You wish to organise all Catholics into a single party, without other support, without other basis than that of religion, but you have not reflected that by that fact alone you organise the Protestant population as a single party, and that then instead of peace and harmony which now exists amongst the different elements of our Canadian nation, you will bring on war, religious war, the most frightful of all wars."

Then he went on to refer to the peace and happiness existing among all classes in Canada. He said:

"But if we are a conquered race, we have also made a conquest—the conquest of liberty. We are a free people. We are in the minority; but we have preserved all our rights and privileges. Again, why is it that this liberty is so valuable to us? It is because it is the constitution which was won for us by our fathers; and which we to-day enjoy. We have a constitution that places the Government in the hands of the people. We have a constitution that has been granted to us for our own defence. We have not greater privileges, but we have as many rights and privileges as the other races which compose the Canadian family. Again, it must not be forgotten that the other members of the Canadian family are divided into two parties—the Liberal and the Conservative."

Then the hon. gentleman spoke out for his country and gave his countrymen advice, which it is greatly to be regretted was not before him when he made his speech at the Champ de Mars. He further said:

"No, there is a fatal law which shall have always the same effect, in morality as in physics. Where there is compression there must be a violent and ruinous explosion. I do not say this to palliate revolution. I hate revolutions; I detest every attempt to force opinion by violence."

The hon. gentleman, after making these remarks, after teaching his countrymen constitutional rights, constitutional law and principles, went before an audience, and, in an hour of excitement, ere he had the documents before him, ere he had the report of the trial, ere he had a case upon which to base a fair judgment, told them that had he been on the banks of the Saskatchewan, he would have had his musket on his shoulder in rebellion against the Government and against the Queen, whom he had faithfully promised to sustain and support with all due allegiance, when he became a Minister of the Crown. There have been charges hurled against the Conservative party in this House that they play with loaded dice. Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, and I ask you and through you, the country, who and what party have played with loaded dice; who is to-day gambling with the destinies, with the national interests of the country? Who is gambling with the sacred causes of Justice?—if not hon. gentlemen opposite—I do not say all of them—but I do say that to-day we have a party arrayed against constitutional Government, and we have the Conservative party, the constitutional party in this House, who are fighting the battle fairly and honestly against men who have no object, no ambition, no method in their actions, save and except the one idea of office. I have spoken as briefly as possible, not being desirous of occupying the time of the House any longer than absolutely necessary. But when a question of this kind comes up, though I may represent a constituency or I may not, I for one shall go for country, for constitution, for law, be the origin of the man whose fate is in question, English, Irish, French or Scotch. Sir, why is it that in times of trouble, in the hour of excitement and national danger, the people look with confidence to the Conservative party—feel that they are able to guide the Ship of State over the breakers, feel that they would scorn to betray their trust, that they would scorn to jeopardise the constitution or to make capital out of the nation's tribulations? It is because Conservatives have the courage of their opinions; it is because Conservatives have confidence in the present and future of their country; it is because Conservatives properly estimate the genius of the era in which they live, and realise that a nation governed on mere experimental principles cannot hope to keep pace with the march of modern civilisation. To-day the world's progress, the world's ceaseless activity, will not allow men time to consider mere threadbare doctrines or to