

condemned the murder unequivocally, but he asked the House to consider the matter carefully and dispassionately.

Mr. SCHULTZ said that, in view of the fact that he had seconded the motion for the expulsion of Louis Riel from the House, it might seem strange that he should have anything to say in favour, yet, since Riel was not present to state his own case he had something to say which might be construed as favouring an amnesty. He could not go as far in his favour as his hon. friend the member for Durham West (Mr. Burk), yet he would make the assertion—a deliberate assertion—that Riel was not the one who caused the insurrection of 1869-1870.

He had stated before, and would now state again in his place in this House, that officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, and not Riel, were the persons who inaugurated the Red River rebellion. Riel was simply their tool to effect their purposes. How far he went before they lost final control of him, he was not prepared to state; but he would endeavour presently to show that those occurrences were impossible had collusion not existed between the officers of that Company and Riel. He felt that hon. gentlemen would find the assertion strange—and yet in Manitoba a great majority of the English-speaking people believed the assertion that he now made—and he was confident that should an investigation be made in a proper manner into the causes of the rebellion it would be shown that not only were the parties referred to in collusion but that at any time within three weeks after its inception the Hudson's Bay Company possessed the power to crush the movement.

It might seem to hon. gentlemen strange that the Hudson's Bay Company could have had any interest in a movement of this sort. The explanation is to be found in the fact that the stockholders in England, who received the large amount paid by Canada, did not propose to divide it with the working officers in the country, as they did the profits of the fur trade. These officers felt that they were unfairly dealt with, and that their only hope of redress consisted in undoing the bargain that Canada and the stockholders had made; and in this fact lay the explanation of their action in 1869.

If doubts were thrown upon this statement, he would read the following extract from a newspaper of the time:—"One of the causes of dissatisfaction amongst the Hudson's Bay Company officers in the Northwest is this,—they say that 300,000 pounds to be paid to the Company by the Canadian Government will be pocketed by the English shareholders, and that not one copper of it will ever be seen by the traders in this country. No doubt they are perfectly right in this view. When the English shareholders get hold of the money they will very likely hold on to it. But the traders of the Northwest proposed a game a little while ago, which, if carried out, would more than make up to them the share of the 300,000 pounds which they say the English shareholders intend robbing them of.

At a meeting of the Council of Rupert's Land, the body which controls the Company's affairs in the Territory, a motion was submitted by one of the chief factors proposing that they should secrete for their special use and benefits furs to the value of 40,000 pounds, to be divided amongst the factors and those interested just

as soon as it should be clearly shown that the English stockholders intended gobbling up the whole of the Canadian purchase money. A lengthy and animated discussion took place on this exceedingly dishonest proposition, after which the motion being put, it was lost simply by the casting vote of the Chairman." It will be seen from this where the difficulty really lay; and in connection with this indication of feeling will be found an explanation of the events of 1869-1870.

Having said this much in favour of Riel and his right to a favourable consideration on this question of amnesty, he was afraid that it was all that he could say, and he must urge a few reasons why an amnesty should not, in his opinion, be granted. In the first place, much as he desired that sectional and national prejudices should be kept down, much as he desired peace and prosperity for Manitoba and the Northwest, he did not feel that the granting of an amnesty would secure either of these objects. There was danger of a repetition of the occurrences of 1869 in the valley of the Saskatchewan; and he believed, and warned hon. gentlemen, that the result of an amnesty, if granted, would be to encourage each movement, if the Métis of that region found that robbery and murder could be committed with impunity. If these offenses were not only not punished, but also condoned, by Government, we might at any time hear of some other Riel creating a Provisional Government whenever there were goods to plunder or a Canadian to murder.

In addition to this danger there was to be considered its effects on the Indian tribes. These had been attentive spectators of the events of 1869, and to their credit it was to be said that not one individual Indian ever had joined the Riel movement, although presents had been most lavishly made and the greatest exertions used by Riel, who knew perfectly well that, if they were allied with him, no military expedition could penetrate through the defiles and passes of their country, and that he could then bid defiance to the Dominion. What would be the effect on these Indians now if an amnesty were granted? He had passed through the country in 1869, and had talked with them in their camps, and one and all said, "The Queen's arm is long; in the spring her warriors will come and punish these men." The warriors indeed came, but not the punishment; and when it was known among these people, as it was sure to be known, that robbery and murder were not always punished by the white man's law, they would not be slow to take a leaf out of our books and when the occasion presented itself for their doing the same they would not be slow to remind us of the precedent. He would warn hon. gentlemen of the importance of the vote from this point of view, and should the amendment unfortunately carry, he would recommend the Government to double, and even treble, their contemplated armed force in the Northwest, for he felt that they would need it all when only this precedent was established.

In regard to the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton), he felt that delay was almost as bad as the granting of an amnesty. He had no confidence in the likelihood of the Committee being able to report fully and fairly on the matter, and the hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. Smith), who