

Parliament there and vote away our rights and privileges. I am, as far as this question goes, up to the handle, a Home Ruler. We will govern our own country. We will put on the taxes ourselves. If we choose to misgovern ourselves, we will do so, and we do not desire England, Ireland or Scotland to tell us we are fools. We will say, if we are fools we will keep our folly to ourselves."

The House will observe that those are the *ipsissima verba* as I gave them the other night. I am bound, in justice to the First Minister, to say that he did not contradict my statement. In the rest of the speech, which I have examined carefully, I find no reference whatever, except a very short line, to the subject of Imperial federation. The hon. gentleman simply goes on to give his reasons for preferring annexation to independence. From the beginning to the end I cannot find one single word of the quotation which the Minister of the Interior read, and which he thought I had confounded with the speech of the First Minister, so that, I think, I am justified in saying that I neither made any important omission nor in any degree misrepresented the First Minister's statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the date?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Twenty-third November, 1881. It was made before the convention in Toronto. That was the speech from which I quoted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, I think, said 1883—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—instead of 1881. And the Minister of the Interior referred to my speech in 1884. In the autumn of 1884 I made a speech in Toronto, and my hon. friend quoted from that speech, in which I elaborated the subject. My hon. friend quoted from my speech at that meeting in Toronto and thought the hon. gentleman had alluded to that speech, as in fact I thought. I forgot that I had spoken at all in 1881.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hon. gentlemen opposite think there is something inconsistent in the statement made by the hon. gentleman in the speech from which I quoted and the remarks quoted by the member from Centre Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). As a matter of fact, if the hon. gentleman will read carefully the speech I read he will find that the passages are in exactly the same sense as the speech from which he has just quoted: that is to say, that the First Minister was opposed to a form of Imperial federation such as was described by the leader of the Opposition in a very famous deliverance at Aurora some years ago, in which he urged representation in the Imperial Parliament, which would involve, in the very nature of things, the cession of some of the privileges which we now enjoy as an independent Parliament of this Dominion. But he went on further, and elaborated in exactly the same terms that he used on several occasions—in Montreal and other places—a scheme of Imperial consolidation, which would be practically an alliance of semi-independent kingdoms for the maintenance of the peace of the world; and there is no possible inconsistency between the quotations which the hon. gentleman has read, as he will see upon looking at the earlier passages of the quotations which I read to the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say—I did not observe it at the time, else I would have taken the opportunity of correcting him then—that the hon. gentleman used words with reference to myself, which I think were hardly parliamentary. He said, speaking of my reference to his speech at the St. George's Club, that I had "foisted in the word 'beautiful.'" As the hon. gentleman has made that statement, I may be permitted to quote the language of his speech from the *Canadian Gazette* of January 7th, 1886:

"Let us take the case of the Dominion of Canada, every acre of which is a beautiful climate"—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; the hon. gentleman said I spoke of the beautiful soil.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all; I think I can settle that question. The hon. gentleman is probably excusable for forgetting what he spoke in 1881, but I think he should be able to remember what he said so short a time ago as last Friday. Here is what the hon. gentleman said:

"He spoke about exaggeration, when I said that every acre in the Dominion of Canada was in a healthful climate; the hon. gentleman foisted in the word 'beautiful.'"

That is, that I foisted in the word "beautiful," instead of the word "healthful." Then he says that the words he used were, "a healthful climate" instead of "a beautiful climate." I simply object to being accused of foisting in the word "beautiful," when I referred to the hon. gentleman's speech as applied to the climate of Canada—that is all.

#### RETURNS RE DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W.

Mr. BLAKE. The House will recollect that, at various periods of last Session, demands were made for large numbers of papers, some described particularly and some by reference to classes, with reference to the communications which had passed between the Government and officials and other individuals in the North-West Territories, prior to and during the early period of the rebellion. The House will also recollect that promises were made that these papers would be produced, if not last Session, this Session. I wish to enquire whether it is the purpose of the Government to bring down those papers at an early day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall revive my recollection of the numerous, or rather the numberless, demands which were made for these papers, and we shall see what papers it is proper to bring down, and shall bring them down.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would ask if it is proposed to lay on the Table of the House the report of the trial of Louis Riel, in a complete form. The hon. gentleman will find that very important passages are omitted from the report of that trial—for instance the discussions which took place between the counsel for the Crown and counsel for the prisoner on motion to adjourn the trial, the charge of the judge, a large portion of the evidence of Charles Nolin, and especially that portion of the cross-examination which has relation to the insanity of the prisoner, and the arguments of counsel as to the charge of the judge. All these are omitted, and I would ask if it is intended to bring the report down in a complete form?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would say to the hon. gentleman that what has been published is the whole evidence taken at the trial. The speeches have not been published, as they are found in the records which were transmitted to the Department of Justice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is a great deal more than the speeches omitted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The speeches were not published and for a very good reason, because they did not form a part of the evidence in the case. The only portion of the speeches which might be taken as part of the evidence, is the speech of the prisoner, which was published. I understand, however, that the House will order the re-printing of copies of these documents, and if it is desired, the speeches will also be included.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The charge of the judge was omitted, and that certainly is a very important portion of the trial, and it certainly ought to be before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that in this case as in all other criminal cases, the