and strong the foundations of future greatness. The man is a traitor to his country, is jeopardising the interests of his country, who, for the sake of party interest, for the promotion of party gain, would stir up race against race, section against section, brother against brother. I know what party gain and party tactics mean, but that is quite another matter from setting Province against Province, race against race, and brother against brother; and when the rallying cry is: A united Dominion, and the flag of our nation is run up, we should find every true Canadian, whether of French, German, English, Scotch, Irish or Canadian origin, rallying round that flag, until the enemies of our country are driven from their strongholds. If I speak warmly, it is because I realise that a few mistakes may may prove fatal to national autonomy. I have given plain facts and figures, and challenge any hon. gentleman to show that I have spoken beyond or outside of the records. Every statement I have made I am prepared to defend, for I feel that this is a question which should be discussed on its merits-not on the basis of Provinces or origin, but a question as to whether, when rebels raisethe flag of rebellion in the North-West, or any other section of in this Dominion, led by an amnestied rebel and a virtual outlaw, the Parliament of Canada should tolerate an amendment which expresses illconcealed sympathy with the misguided men who instigated that rebellion. By expressing sympathy with those who claim they have grievances, we express sympathy with the men who went to Montana to induce Riel to come to the country, and sympathy for Riel, who returned to the North-West as a claimant of lands to which he cannot be entitled. Riel, who while that country was in trouble, while hard times were abroad in it boldly admits that he took advantage of the depression to countenance extreme measures. These men found among the Opposition, those who were decrying the country, who were preventing capital from coming in, who were opposing the completion of a great public work, the very element needful to accomplish their nefarious schemes, and the result is that we have had bloodshed, and our friends have fallen. But no great interest was ever established in any country, without loss of life, and those who fell at Duck Lake, at Batoche, at Fish Creek and other places, will be remembered as partiots who fought bravely the battles of their country; and while they have gone before, we know that we have soon to follow; and though we lost a brother member of this House, sad as that loss may be, it will, at least, teach us to love our country better, and we will be able to say that when the union was in peril English and French, Scotch and Irish, and Gormans, all combined to fight the battles of the nation and to maintain the flag which I trust will always float over a country possessing one of the freest and best constitutions in the world, the future home of millions of prosperous people, hardy sons of the north whose hearts will ever throb responsive to national sentiment; millions worthy the race whence they sprung, true to the motherland, rejoicing when she rejoices and sympathising with and defending her should trial, tribulation or adversity at any time afflict or overtake the Empire.

Mr. MILLS. It is not my intention to devote much time to the consideration of the observations which the hon. member for this city has addressed to the House for the past two hours. I have failed altogether to see their relevancy to the proposition which is now before you for the consideration of the House. If the hon, member for Jacques Cartier had made the observations which he has addressed to the House some seven or eight years ago, they might have had more value. The hon, gentleman proposes to put on trial a Government that ceased to exist in October, 1878.

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

tlemen now sitting on the Treasury benches at that time occupied seats on this side of the House. It was part of their business, in the discharge of their public duties, to watch with care the administration of public affairs—to criticise the conduct of the Government, and point out the mistakes which that Government made. But now, Sir, seven years after that Government has left office, it is too late to begin to bring charges that those hon gentlemen did not venture to bring when the Government were responsible for the conduct of affairs. I might, Sir, at some other time, be disposed to go into some detail in defence of the conduct of that Government, with regard to the various matters that have been passed in review the last few days. I shall but briefly allude to these charges, because I do not think that they are important for the consideration of the House at this moment. I do not intend to be drawn away from the important proposition submitted to the House by the hon. member for West Durham, by a discussion of what the Government did some eight or ten years ago. The hon, member who has just taken his seat has charged the Opposition with sympathising with Riel, with defending the rebels and with upholding the rebellion. I deny that charge. I say that we are not putting Riel on trial in this House. He is shortly to be tried before another tribunal, and I hope, when his trial takes place, that he will be judged according to the evidence there submitted, and not according to charges made on that side of the House or this. I am quite ready to repeat the words which are used on the trial of anyone for so serious an offence—that I trust he will have a fair trial by God and his countrymen. The hon, gentleman knows that in the estimation of a great many the Government committed mistakes in 1869 and 1870. Riel committed murder. The hon. gentleman knows that the feeling in the minds of a great many of the community is still a feeling of resentment for that crime, and he takes advantage of that feeling in order to shelter the Government for their misconduct during the last seven years. Sir, I do not intend to be drawn in that direction; I do not intend to say one word of the conduct of Mr. Riel, either by way of censure or by way of excuse. His case is in the hands of another tribunal, and I feel that it would be indecent, on my part, under the circumstances, to discuss it. Sir, the hon, gentleman says this resolution is a defence of Riel. Now, let me read the resolution. It is:

"That in the administration of North-West affairs by the present Government, prior to the recent outbreak, there have occurred grave instances of neglect, delay and mismanagement, in matters affecting the peace, welfare and good government of the country."

The question is, are the charges set forth in that resolution well founded. The question is not whether those who took arms against the Government had any cause, or whether the cause was sufficient to become an extenuating circumstance. It is the Government we have to try; not the parties who have been engaged in the rebellion in the North-West Territories. Their trial is vested in other hands, and it will be conducted according to other evidence than that which is submitted to the House for the purpose of either approving or disapproving of the conduct of the Administration. The hon. First Minister, in discussing this question the other evening, said that the Hudson Bay Company officials in the North-West Territories had always exhibited discontent, that they were disloyal, that they had been pushed by the Canadian Government from their throne, and had never become reconciled to their position; he said the half-breeds of the North-West had long been in the employ of the Hudson Bay Company—that they were their factors and bunters, and that they sympathised with the officers of the company; and he told us that Gabriel Dumont was a rebel in 1870, a rebel in 1874, and he was a The hon, gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 rebel still. Well, Sir, I do not know how that may be, nor the Government of the hon, member for East York was administering the affairs of the country; that the hon, gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 rebel still. Well, Sir, I do not know how that may be, nor the Government of the hon, gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 rebel still. Well, Sir, I do not know how that may be, nor administering the affairs of the country; that the hon, gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 rebel still. Well, Sir, I do not know how that may be, nor the country is that the hon, gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 rebel still. Well, Sir, I do not know how that may be, nor the country is that the hon, gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 rebel still. Well, Sir, I do not know how that may be, nor the country is that the hon gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 rebel still.