(Continued from 1st page.)

the affairs of Canada, especially during the last four years. In Ontario the leader of the Liberals, the Hon. Edward Blake, has been holding meetings, sometimes two or three in a county, acting as if he were actively engaged in the work of an election campaign, and endeavoring to prove to the people of that great province, that the government of the day is no longer worthy of the support which in the past has been accorded to it, and I find that in this province the worthy and active leader of the Liberal party in the Maritime Provinces (Mr. Davies) has been doing similar work. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that so far as I am personally concerned it will be more agreeable for me to deal to-night with large questions of public policy, which have characterized the administration of affairs during the last eight years, than to dwell on minor subjects. To do this I shall trace out in your presence the result of our policy, for I recognize the fact that a Government is always upon its trial, and I am also aware of the fact that no government can afford to have serious charges made against it, its members or supporters, without being ready with an answer whenever the opportunity is afforded it. I propose, therefore, to-night to take up but one branch of the subject to which Mr. Davies referred in his speech from this platform a few evenings ago, and to leave to my honorable colleagues the privilege of dealing with other important questions.

Mr. Davies in the speech which he delivered here in Moncton charged the leader of the Government, Sir John Macdonald with making attacks upon provincial rights. He, (Mr. Davies,) asserted that Sir John from the first to the last of his career was always in favor of a legislative union, and that ever since he has been in power, his one object and motive has been to destroy the autonomy of the provinces and to bring about if he could the centralization of power in Ottawa. If Mr. Davies had dealt fairly in the illustration which he gave, of that tendency on the part of Sir John A. Macdonald, I would have been very glad to leave the matter to the judgment of those who heard him, to determine whether that charge was rightly directed against Sir John or not, but when we remember that during the five years which the Liberal party were in office no fewer than seventeen provincial bills passed by the provincial legislature were disallowed, when we remember that no Minister of Justice who ever held that important office in the government of Canada was more minute in his exception to provincial legislation and more exacting in his criticisms of legislation than was Hon. Edward Blake himself, it seems to me that it comes with ill grace from one who boasts of Mr. Blake as the embodiment of a pure and high-minded statesman to charge the mere disallowance of provincial acts by Sir John Macdonald as being an evidence of the tendency on the part of him who disallows the bill to bring about centralization of power in Ottawa.

Let me give you, ladies and gentlemen, in a few words an illustration. First he said that Sir John A. Macdonald had attempted to give the control of escheats to the Dominion. If he had told them the fact he would have told them that when Mr. Mowatt's administration passed an act during the regime of the Mackenzie Government claiming the escheats for that Province it was disallowed by Mr. Fournier, the Minister of Justice in Mr. Mackenzie's administration. (Applause.)

Then he said that Sir John A. Macdonald was not a great constitutional lawyer, because in the matter of the Ontario boundary award he had been defeated by the Privy Council. I am not going to discuss that award here. We threshed that out in Ontario. In Ontario, in 1882, the people gave to Sir John A. Macdonald a large majority, in spite of the charges made against him in connection with that award; but what I want to point out is this, that the only question unsolved without dispute was whether the award made by the arbitrators was a valid and binding award in itself, and when the subject came up to be discussed before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that committee decided the question raised in favor of Sir John A. Macdonald, without hearing the argument of counsel employed by the Government. (Cheers.)

Then he gave another illustration—the streams bill. That is an Ontario question with which perhaps you are not familiar or do not care to be familiar, but when I tell you that there was no constitutional question involved in that act at all in so far as the decision of the Privy Council was concerned, when I tell you that the only question involved was the right of legislatures to exercise judicial functions and decide questions by party vote which were still pending before the courts at the very time the matter was dealt with in the legislature, and when I tell you this was the only question raised, there is not a gentleman in this room, liberal or conservative, that will not say Sir John Macdonald did right in laying down the principle that such questions should be decided not by a party vote but by the proper tribunals. This is the only question so far as the disallowance of an act was concerned. Another case that might be referred to is one arising over a stream which passed through lands owned in both banks on either side by a Mr. McLaren; the stream not being a navigable stream, or an unfloatable stream as they are called in Ontario, and he having made improvements upon that stream objected to others using it. He brought the case before the various courts, when finally on appeal the Supreme Court by a unanimous judgment set aside the contention of McLaren—and who do you think was the counsel for McLaren in that case? Mr. Edward Blake! He had taken his fee for the arguing of that case before the appeal court on McLaren's behalf, and then had the ineffable meanness, when his opinion was set aside, to use the defeat of his opinion, for which he had taken this man's money, to raise a case against Sir John A. Macdonald. (Applause.)

Now these illustrations of Mr. Davies, if we go no further than those made by him in regard to the constitutional question, have been about the issue shown between the Government of Canada, with regard to the question of disallowance; but we find that having dealt with that subject he referred to the Government's dealings with this question in the vast domain of the Northwest. In regard to that matter he told his audience in this hall that the Government, instead of having wisely managed the affairs of the Northwest, had parcelled out that territory to its friends and supporters, and had been giving timber limits, grazing lands, and coal areas to colonization companies, thus corrupting Parliament in such a way that there was scarcely a man on the ministerial side of the House who had not in this way received some favor from the Government. Now, that is a question in which I think the people of New Brunswick are as deeply interested as any people in this wide Dominion, for the North-West is the common heritage of us all, and upon its proper development and rapid settlement must depend, in a great measure, the future prosperity and happiness of Canada as a whole, so that I make no apology for discussing that question here in New Brunswick and of saying that in my opinion how utterly unwarranted were the statements of Mr. Davies. Let me therefore give you one or two facts in reference to this subject. Mr. Davies in dealing with the question of colonization companies said that instead of giving the land of the North West to actual settlers, the Government had given them to colonization companies, and that from the permits there given members of Parliament derived important advantages as the result of their being formed. In the first place let me say having regard to the general policy which both parties followed in reward to the North West that the formation of colonization companies and granting of North West lands to them has not interfered with the matter of settlement in that country. The great North West has been surveyed on what is called the "rectangular system," and the lots or "sections" as they are called are divided into odd and even sections and the odd and even sections are open to homestead and pre-emption. Any man may go in upon these lands and by paying one dollar can make an entry for 160 acres and can claim a homestead on which if he makes certain improvements within three years he can secure a patent.

These colonization companies only had possession of the odd sections within the area granted to them—the even sections were there, as everywhere else throughout the Northwest, open to settlers; the colonization companies could not interfere with them in the least. What the colonization companies agreed to do is this:—The Government thought and it was pressed upon them by the people of Canada very strongly and especially by the people of the North west, that if they could enlist private capitalists in the work of bringing settlers into the North-west that the effect would be to settle more rapidly the country than otherwise. The colonization company in getting the grant had to pay $2 an acre for the odd sections which they bought and they had to pay down one-quarter of that in cash, and then they were required within 5 years to put in two settlers; then having done that at the end of 5 years they were to get a rebate of $1 an acre for every settler they put upon the ground and so were able to secure their patent of settlement. This policy had been advertized in the newspapers of the country and was open to all who wished to enter upon the land. There were only 260 application for charters for colonizing the the North-west. Of these only 117 were authorised by order in council because those who applied were not considered as having the necessary capital to carry on the work, but only 28 of that 117 were entered into; for when people came to look into the matter and at the obligations they were undertaking and to realize how little real profit there was in these colonization companies the vast majority declined finally to enter into contracts at all.

Now, how many members of Parliament do you think were interested in these companies? From Mr. Davies speech as I read it, I would imagine that this policy had been adopted for the very purpose of bribing and corrupting the members of the house but when I tell you that there were only 5 members of Parliament and that three of these were clear grits, I think you will agree with me that there is not much in it. (Cheers.) First, there was Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, the late leader of the liberal party, who having been deposed from the leadership without much ceremony, is now accused of having entered into a corrupt bargain with the Government in regard to these companies. He was president of one. Then we have Messrs. Gunn and Sutherland—three clear Grits, and the two Conservatives were Mr. James Beatty of Toronto and Mr. Clark Wallace of West York. Then in the Senate there were 5 Senators; one being Mr. R. W. Scott who was leader of the Senate during the Mackenzie regime, a member of the Mackenzie Government—Mr. Reesor, a prominent grit member of the Senate—Messrs. Ryan, Ogilvie and Gibbs, 3 Conservatives. So taking all the members of Parliament, the Senate as well as well as the House of Commons, there was exactly 5 Conservatives and 5 Liberals who were connected with these colonization companies—corrupted by the Government by means of such companies.

Now what was the result to the Government of all this? Why, they received from these companies $760,253—that is the amount paid to the Government in connection with these schemes, and we have sworn testimony of their auditor that they have expended in the work of colonizing no less than $367,932, and this summer I have been compelled, as Minister of the Interior, to endeavor to effect a satisfactory settlement with these companies, who have simply lost the money they put in and their hope is in the future, on the development of that country, in order that they may get something out of the smaller area of land we have given in settling the contract with them.

Hon. Mr. Davies told us and in doing so he made the extraordinary statement on this platform that during last session, one member after another rose in the House of Commons, and denied the charges made against them, and that when Mr. Charlton had produced his proof they got up one after another and admitted their correctness; but declared they had forgotten all about them. Let me give you the exact facts with regard to the matter. In dealing with the question of timber limits in North-West before the year 1873, when Sir John A. Macdonald was formerly in power at Ottawa, his policy was to give timber limits to all applying for them by public competition; but during the first session after Mr. McKenzie came into office a bill was passed destroying the policy of his predecessors and adopting the policy of giving these timber limits and coal areas to whom so ever might apply for them, upon the fulfilment of some general conditions. This policy was continued during Mr. McKenzie's lease of power, and was in force when Sir John came back again. What was the result of the policy? During his time Mr. McKenzie gave leases for 605 square miles of timber limits in the North-West, and he received cash for those timber dues, and everything in connection with the North-West amounting to $6,160. When Sir John came into office he gave a number of licenses which I will refer to in a moment: and during the last five years he has received up to the last parliament $539,433 for ground rent, bonuses, etc. This all came into the public treasury as the results of our policy. Now, the policy followed was a general policy, open to any person. Any one might come in and get timber limits, provided he was willing to comply with the conditions, provided he gave evidence when he made the application that he intended to comply with these conditions. The policy was to divide those timber limits into an area of 50 square miles. Now in a province like New Brunswick, fifty square miles would be a large amount of land, but in a country like the North-West, where trees are small and sparse, fifty square miles is not by any means too large for a timber license. After a man made his application for a timber limit the government compels him to get an order-in-council before the minister would authorize the issue of a license. Then the man had to survey the limit. He had to pay $250, and then he had to survey the limit. He was obliged to put up a mill capable of cutting 10,000 feet in twelve hours, and when he had done all that he came to the Government and got his license.

Now gentlemen, let me point out to you that of the 2029 applications made to the Government for these timber limits in the North West out of this number of applications there were only 508 orders in Council issued. These people had to pay their first instalment in advance of $250 for the royalty of each license. What was the result? The Government received in advance for leases $24,062.27 which was a clear net gain to the people of the country under the policy of the Government.

Then they received for bonuses—because if there were ten persons applied for the same limit, the policy of the Govt. was to invite competition between them and he who gave the highest bonus was to receive the license as soon as he had complied with the conditions—they received no less than $21,226.25 for bonuses in connection with limits that the parties never complied with the conditions of and never received a license authorizing them to cut and so the Govt. has got $45,288.52 in connection with timber limits where the people who paid the money did so simply for the privilege of paying and who never had an opportunity of cutting a single stick of lumber. Although 508 orders in council were passed, only 107 leases were granted. Mr. Davies said the other day that the Government had granted lease after lease up to 25,000 square miles. That statement was like most of the statements made on that occasion—it was just five times too high, instead of 25,000 only some 5,000 square miles were granted during the whole time referred to by Mr. Davies in his speech. Of these 96 were for yearly tenancies and the balance, 11, for 21 years.

Now it is charged that these were granted to members of parliament, but when I tell you that only two members of parliament ever obtained a lease for cutting timber in the Northwest you will see how much truth there was in the statement made by Davies, and when I tell you that one of these was Mr. Hugh Sutherland, a Grit, you will easily understand that there was not the conception which has been stated to exist in connection with it. Mr. Davies asked you to look at the Hansard—to which he was fond of referring you—to see the list of names of members of parliament given there who had made application and who had been granted by their friends grants from the Government, but if you will look at the Hansard you will see a list of names improperly inserted there, of gentlemen whose only crime was that they had been asked by some of their friends to make the application for them, and not for the members themselves. The mere fact that the application was made was no act of corruption, especially when the party applying did not get the timber limit and received no benefit from it.

I will read here one or two of the letters referred to. You will remember Mr. Davies said that when Mr. Charlton read these letters the gentlemen admitted they had forgotten all about them; still it is deemed a corrupt act. These letters I read to show in what terms they charge corruption, for being themselves public men they should at least have some respect for the character of others also in public life in this Dominion:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS,
"OTTAWA, 13th MAY, 1882.

"SIR,—May I draw your attention to the application made by Mr. Sanders for a coal license. I should very much like to know if this application has been entertained, and that the lease is to issue therefor

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"DALTON MCCARTHY."

You will agree with me that there is nothing very terrible in that letter, and yet upon the strength of that letter, Mr. McCarthy is charged with being bought by the Government, and with having voted for the Government because he had written that letter. The answer is:—

"DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR,
"OTTAWA, May 23rd, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by the direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th inst. re the application of Mr. Sanders, and to reply that up to the present time none of the coal applications have been entertained.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"L. A. HAMILTON.

These, ladies and gentlemen, are the simple letter and answer, and these you will find in the pages of Hansard, to which you have been referred as containing evidence of the corruption prevailing in connection with the Department of the Interior.

"TORONTO, NOVEMBER 11th, 1882.

"SIR,—I beg to enclose you herewith Mr. Robert Cassidy's application for a coal mine limit, to be composed of the east half of section 36, township 20, range 21, North-West Territory, as shown on the accompanying map, and I shall be very glad to hear that his application has been favorably entertained.

"Yours truly,
"DALTON MCCARTHY.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OTTAWA, 21st November, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst, recommending the application of Mr. Robert Cassidy for a coal-mining limit, to be composed of the east half of section 36, township 20, range 21, North-West Territory, and in reply beg leave to inform you that the ground in question is covered by a prior application.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"A. RUSSELL."

That was the result of that application, and yet that application is one of those to be found on the list of members of parliament to which you were referred and who are charged with having been corrupted by the manner in which the public domain has been dealt with by the government.

Here is another with regard to this matter:

GANANOQUE, 3rd October, 1882.

To the Hon. the Minister of the Interior, Ottawa:

"DEAR SIR,—A friend of mine wishes me to enquire on what terms the department will grant a timber limit in the Northwest territories, in townships supposed to be 39, 40 and 41, in ranges 18, 19 and 20 west, at a place called Passenger Hill. He is anxious to secure a limit. Your early reply will much oblige.

"I have the honor to be, sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"(Signed) GEO. TAYLOR.

Now, that was not a very dangerous letter. What was the answer to it? It was as follows:

"Department of the Interior.
"OTTAWA, 10 October, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the minister, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant enquiring on what terms the Government will grant you a timber limit in the Northwest territories, in townships 39, 40 and 41 in ranges 18, 19 and 20 west, of the second meridian; and in reply herewith enclose a copy of the timber regulations.

"I have the honor to be, sir,
"Your obidient servant,
"(Signed) A. RUSSELL,
"For Surveyor General."

Nothing more ever came of that—that was the last of it. In all these cases the letter was received by the department and an answer sent containing the regulations as to obtaining limits, yet knowing this Mr. Davies stood upon this platform and told the people of Westmorland who were listening to him that the government of the day had been corrupting members of parliament with these timber limits and with other advantages connected with the North-West. (Applause.)

Then Sir John A. Macdonald was charged in parliament with having with Sir Charles Tupper secured great advantages for their sons who happen to be lawyers in the city of Winnipeg and a number of specific charges were made by Mr. Cameron as to the manner in which they had been using their influence with regard to services that were performed at Winnipeg. A record was obtained from the department as to this, and what is the result? Here is the first case:

"From the evidence, so far as it has been submitted—and it has only been partially submitted—these two young men appear to have secured a timber limit on the Swan River in the name of one John McMahon. Several partners were interested in that limit, and these two young men had a ninth blind share in it. But that was not sufficient to compensate these two young men for the valuable services they had rendered in securing the limit, and so the Order in Council granting it was cancelled. A new deal was effected; a new Order in Council was issued, granting the timber limit to T. P. Walsh, John McMahon, the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, and Macdonald and Tupper, and in that timber limit Macdonald and Tupper held three-fifths interest; and the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, pet and friend of this Administration, offered to sell his interest in it for $50,000. I have always been amazed and astounded, considering the charges that have been made against Edgar Dewdney by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite in Parliament and out of Parliament, who have denounced this man as utterly unfit for the position he occupies—I say I have been surprised that a man so described by the Government's own friends, should have been retained in his place until a rebellion broke out, to some extent through his instrumentality, and even after it broke out. The mystery is no longer a mystery, this litigation has unravelled it."

Mr. Cameron,—I sent over to the Department of the Interior to find out all about this John McMahon and his grant, and these are the facts, as conveyed to me by the officers of that Department:—

"On the 18th January, 1883, an application from John McMahon was received in the Department for a timber limit on the Swan River. This application was originally signed by J. B. McArthur, but McArthur's name was erased and John McMahon's substituted therefor. On the 16th March, 1883, an amended application was received from John McMahon, by his attorneys, Macdonald & Tupper. This application was granted on the usual conditions, which McMahon found so onerous that on the 15th Nov., 1883, he surrendered the limit, having paid $250 ground rent thereon. On the 19th December, 1883, the same limit was granted to T. P. Walsh, Walsh never complied with the conditions, and has therefore no longer an interest in the limit, which remains in the Crown."

That disposes of that. The next case is this:

"On the 8th November, 1882, Moffatt applied for a limit on the Leaf River. This limit was afterwards found to be in the disputed territory. In accordance with the then policy of the Department, it was granted, but no license has been issued since the decision of the Privy Council. Moffatt is a member of the firm of Moffatt and Calewell, bankers, Winnipeg. He is a responsible man, and there is nothing to connect the firm of Macdonald & Tupper with the application beyond the fact that Hugh Macdonald wrote a private letter to the Deputy Minister—"

Cameron—That is Mr. Burgess:

"—telling him who Moffatt was, and later McArthur, owing to Moffatt's absence in England, applied for extension of leave within which to make survey."

Cameron—Then again:

"These young men appear further to have secured section 32, township 21, range 20, and section 36, township 21, range 21, west of the fourth principal meridian, 1,280 acres of coal lands at the Blackfoot Crossing, where it is alleged, the best coal lands in the country are, and these worthy representatives of worthy sires had one-half blind share in that little deal."

Cameron—The next charge is:

"These worthy sons of worthy sires do not appear to have limited their operations to coal and timber lands. They were willing to turn a penny in any way out of the public resources of the country, over which their fathers then had full control, and so they applied for the salt springs flowing into lake Winnipegosis, and Mr. Hall of the Department of the Interior, wrote them that those lake salt springs could be had at $5 an acre. These young men appear to have had a blind share in that little deal also."

Cameron—Now, Sir, they had a perfect right to apply for these springs if they could get them. The reply to this charge is this:

"On the 9th August, 1883, Macdonald & Tupper applied, under instructions from their client, Mr. Peter Barclay, of Birtle, for a salt spring on lake Winnipegosis. They were informed that if their client could establish priority of discovery he could get forty acres at $10 an acre on the prescribed conditions. He was called upon to prove his discovery in three months. This was more than a year ago, and the Department has heard no more about it."

Cameron—The next charge is:

"When the late Minister of Railway fixed the terminus of the railway at Port Moody, the son of the Premier and the son of the Minister of Railways applied to this Government, over which their fathers wielded unbounded sway, for four hundred acres of the foreshore at Port Moody. Whether they got it or not I do not know, but it is very likely they did not complete the contract because the Canadian Pacific Railway changed the terminus of the road."

Cameron—The answer to that charge is this:

"In August, 1883, J. W. McKay and Albert J. Hill, of New Westminster, applied for certain tidal lands situate at the east end of Port Moody. The application was referred to Mr. Trutch, who, on the 7th November, 1883, reported that, as these lands adjoined the terminal station of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they were of considerable present value and prospective importance. He therefore recommended that the application should not be entertained. Hugh Macdonald wrote, on the 4th November, 1884, asking if Mr. Trutch had reported on his client's application, and on the 24th December, 1884, he was informed of Mr. Trutch's report, and told that in consequence thereof no action would be taken on McKay's application by the Department."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the charge made against Sir John A. Macdonald, that he was using his influence improperly for the benefit of his sons and friends practising in Winnipeg. Mr. Trutch referred to was the agent of the Government in British Columbia. Now here were two sons of the Ministers anxious to get land near the track of the C. P. R. near Port Moody—charged you will see all with having enormous influence with the department; the department wrote the agent of the Government on the spot and found that the land sought for might probably turn out to be of great prospective value to the Government and they refused to sell it in order that the public, the people of Canada might get the advantage of any value that might accrue to that land in the future in consequence of the railway being there. (Applause) These are some samples of these charges—and I could give you any number of them—which go to show how little warrant there was for the statement that members of Parliament have been corrupted by means of the reserves of the great North West Territory. Then they tell us in connection with the grazing leases we had done very wrong. Now, let me present to you exactly what occurred in connection with these leases. The western parts of the territories are peculiarly fitted for grazing. The American ranchmen came from Montana and other western States, in large numbers, bringing with them large numbers of cattle, because they admit that, besides other advantages, the North-West contains the finest grazing areas to be found on this great continent. The Government resolved to utilize them. In the United States it is the custom to allow persons to go in and take preemption and the consequence is that the ranchmen join and take up a homestead next to them and so have the opportunity of using the whole wide domain for grazing their cattle without paying for it. The Government of Canada, however, adopted a different policy that of granting grazing leases—that policy had been in operation for nearly two years. By this policy settlers are not interfered with and in addition to this we have been able to husband and utilize the resources of the North West Territories for the benefit of the people at large. We have already, ladies and gentlemen, received from these leases $96,044 and as the result we also have cattle in the country and large cattle interests are springing up there in a territory which until recently was almost unproductive. Recently contracts had been made with these cattle men for the supply of meat to the Mounted Police and the Indians and out of these contracts alone we will make in the three years no less than $121,500 for we have the cattle in our own country instead of being obliged as formerly to go into Montana to get the beef supply for our Indians and Mounted Police. These then have been the practical results of this policy. Had members of Parliament anything to do with that? I do not know a single member of Parliament who has had anything to do in connection with the grazing leases of the North-West but if there had been he as well as any other man would have had to pay his rental to the Government. There would be nothing more done in his favor, than is done for anybody else who goes there and every one who may choose to apply for such leases may obtain them. (Applause).

Then as to the coal areas, What has been the result of the policy we have adopted? We have received from the development of the coal areas $45,738, and what is better than that the settlers in the Northwest and people of Winnipeg are now buying their coal for which a few years ago they paid $17, for $6 and $7 a ton as the result of the policy of the Government. (Applause.) Now, that briefly stated, means that the policy of the Government in connection with the Northwest Territories has given them their coal at a lower rate than formerly. Now I ask of any one if in view of this fact and other facts we have actually accomplished if Mr. Davies was justified in charging from this platform that instead of encouraging the settlement of that country they had used the enormous resources of the Northwest, and had given up that domain not for the purpose of settling the country, but had given them to members of the Dominion Parliament and their political friends throughout the country?

What has been the policy of the Government in reference to the settlement of the Northwest? One would imagine from hearing what Mr. Davies said here that the Government had obstructed the settlement of the Northwest. How did they do it? Why their predecessors while they were in office had that Northwest to develope, and how did they do it? By reserving an area of twenty miles on each side. The survey located the line of the C. P. R., between Winnipeg and the Rocky Mountains away up to Edmonton reserving forty miles along each side of the road, for settlement. Settlers who wanted to go upon these lands could do so by paying a dollar down for the acre on which they settled, with the understanding that when that railway was built they would have to pay what they could. Our policy has been this: the odd sections have been opened to settlement and accordingly the railway have reserved the even sections. They are open to every one so that the even sections are open from one end of the country to the other. Any man can go there and get a homestead of 160 acres, and he can get a pre-emption of 160 more and obtain a patent for that, which he can purchase for $1.25 an acre. (Applause.) That has been the policy of the Government in reference to that country, and we believe it is a policy tending to develope and husband the resources of the country. (Applause.)

for the outbreak which occurred there last

We are told that in our management of the Northwest we created rebellion. The opposition hold that we are responsible year, and which resulted in the loss of so much money and blood. Now let me give you one or two facts with reference to the Metis, or half-breeds of the Northwest, who by virtue of the Indian side of their character had certain rights in the soil. They were scattered over all portions of the wide domain. Some of them who were settled in the province of Manitoba at the time of the trouble there it was agreed should receive scrip equal to 160 acres or $160, and for heads of families $240. When the Northwest territories were opened up the Metis in the different parts of that country asked that they should be dealt with in the same way as their brethren of Manitoba. It has always been a serious problem how to deal with these people. Sir John's views were that the Indian title in the Halfbreeds, should have been extinguished at the same time as the Indian title was extinguished, as with the Indians themselves, and if that had been done when Mr. Mackenzie was in power in 1876, for all or most of the treaties were made during that year, this difficulty, as far as the Halfbreeds and their Indian title was concerned, would have been removed. But that was not done and the matter was left unsettled. Both Mr. Mackenzie and his Minister of the Interior, Mr. Mills, treated the matter as one of little consequence. When in 1876 they appointed Mr. Matthew Ryan to examine into this matter, and when he wrote a very civil letter pointing out to the Government that it would be necessary for him to go to where these Halfbreeds were in order to investigate their claims he received instructions written by Mr. Mills himself on the letter sent to Mr. Ryan are these: "If these people desire to have their claims settled they should look after it themselves. It is not necessary for you to hunt them up." This was the spirit in which Mr. Mills dealt with this matter, and when Mr. Ryan went to Qu'Appelle and made some inquiries as to the claims of the Halfbreeds, and when he sent in to the Government a bill for $75 for services, Mr. Mills refused to pay it, and that $75 was not paid until Sir John Macdonald came into office, when it was settled. That was a just debt, and should have been paid long before. (Applause.) This was the condition affairs stood in at that time.

Then there were other questions on which the Halfbreeds felt they were entitled to some consideration. One was the question of survey. In Manitoba in olden times they had had their lands surveyed on the elongated plan, which was a narrow strip of land stretching away back from the river bank, in some cases to two or three miles, and this they preferred to the "rectangular system," applied by Act of Parliament, and which is now applied to all parts of the Northwest Territories. Then there were other favors they asked for, and which were embodied in a letter sent to the Government by Bishop Grandin during the time that Mr. Mackenzie was in office. In that letter they asked that advances of money be made to them for agricultural implements, for seed and for grain, and asking that public institutions of different kinds be established and supported by the Government in that country. All these claims were made during the time Mr. Mackenzie was in office, as well as all the other outside claims and claims affecting their title, and all these claims were everywhere refused by the then Minister of the Interior, Mr. Mills, and I do not think this Government can be charged with failure of duty in treating these cases as Mr. Mills did at that time. As to the survey policy I am bound to say that the policy of the Government was that where the Half Breeds settled on the land in advance of the surveys, the survey should be conducted in accordance with their wishes on the elongated principle; but when they came into the country after the survey was made they were not, although they were told they could get their land by legal subdivision. Now, as to the Halfbreed claims, when I tell you that in the Saskatchewan district where the rebellion broke out, the Halfbreed claims had been settled out in Manitoba, you will come to the conclusion they had very little if any grievance. These Halfbreeds had moved away from Manitoba and settled in the North West, some as far away as the Saskatchewan, and as nearly all of these people obtained their scrip in Manitoba you will agree with me that in that part of the country there was no need of rebellion. (Applause.) But there were many petitions sent in. As to an overwhelming majority of these petitions, the persons presenting them had had their claims settled, and when the commission was sent up, it was only to settle cases with some 16 or 17 persons in the whole district where the trouble arose. We have been told that some 1,700 persons have had their claims settled and scrip issued—aye, and more than that, for the Commissioners have been up there this year, and I believe the number will be more than 2,000, but I also, at the same time, know that these people live in districts where there was no rebellion, and that where the rebellion broke out no scrip was due, the people having already received their scrip in Manitoba. There arose, however, a difficulty as to the manner in which we should deal with the matter. Archbishop Tache, the friend of the half-breeds in the Northwest, opposed the granting of scrip, and he argued, in a letter addressed by him to the Department, that there should be 12 great reserves situate in the Northwest, and upon these the half-breeds should be permitted to live, granting the 160 acres to each, unalienable for three successive generations. The Northwest Council objected to the reserves, they were opposed to the views of Archbishop Tache, and urged, on the other hand, that the grant should be of 160 acres, and that their right in it should be unalienable for 10 years, and it was in this conflict of opinion that the great difficulty and the delay occurred. But, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the fact to be borne in mind is that if the rebellion had not broken out, the delay would not have taken place for the commission had been appointed and the people of the Northwest had been told by Father Andre that such was appointed. We want to go right to the history of that rebellion. The real ground of the rebellion, as developed by the evidence given on the trial, was the determination of Louis Riel to avenge himself for what he thought as wrongs done him in the past and to extort money from the Government.

On this let me give you a couple of affidavits from Halfbreeds in the North West who were there at the time of the rebellion and were in fact engaged in the rebellion. I will first take that of Gilbert Breland:—

"At the time arms taken up I heard from Riel personally that the police were coming in numbers to kill us and outrage and massacre our families and this had a great effect on us all and was what led us to take up arms. It was Riel's plan to deceive us and it succeeded. I heard this from Riel and heard him speaking this way many times; this was the reason given by Riel to get us together and to keep us together at camp at Batoche. At the time Riel never spoke of half-breed rights at all. At the commencement he had but at the time of taking up arms he only spoke of the outrages of be feared from the police. The half-breed rights he had spoken of was the Scrip same as in Manitoba. I was sent for by Riel's men and taken to Batoche. I was allowed sometimes to go and see my family but always ordered to return at once. Several days before the Halcrow meeting among English half-breeds and Riel then told us that it would be wise for us to be ready for any emergency, that he would find out the temper of his friends. Then Boyer and some others suspected that Riel was trying to draw the people into taking up arms as Boyer and others took steps to counteract his influence and Boyer did not therefore attend the Halcrow meeting but went around and advised the people to keep away from Riel's meetings. Then Riel seeing that he was losing his influence over the people by his policy started to influence them by working on their fears and telling them about the police. Sometimes I believed him, some times I did not. And we saw after that, that it was all complete lies by Riel. Generally the half-breed people now all admit that they were deceived in this way by Riel."

Next that of Maxime Lepine:—

"At the commencement of the rebellion I was freighting for Charles Nolin and T. O. Davis, I arrived home about the 18th March and put my loads there, after that I did not see them. I heard it was removed by our men the half-breeds.

After I got home, Riel came to my place, and asked me to go to Batoche, he came in the evening and as I went the next morning I met people coming to take me there. Charles Nolin and I had before this asked Riel to give us the American Citizenship and become a representative for us; this was at the time of the tenders for the telegraph poles. I never understood that Riel wanted to raise a rebellion at all. We wanted him to be a Canadian subject and have a seat in the North-west Council and work for the English half-breeds. Nolin's affair came up before the Council; and I heard on my arrival by the people that Nolin was condemned to death, and after that in council I heard he was to be, but he was not condemned then, though Riel said he was to be. C. Nolin sent me a letter on the road by Ferdinand Labret which I have lost: the substance was for me to be careful of Riel because he meant mischief again. Boyer's trial was finished when I arrived, but I did my best to hinder Nolin's condemnation. I went with Nolin to Crozier with a closed envelope which I did not know the contents of; Nolin told me the letter was a bad one, it was not delivered.

Crozier was then at Carlton; this was three or four days before the Duck Lake fight. On the road with that letter, Nolin asked me for us to deliver ourselves up to Crozier. I do not know the reason I gave, but my principal reason was that I could not leave my family, and I wished to remain there to do my best to quiet the people. The reason Riel gave for condemning Nolin to death was, that Nolin had hindered the people taking up arms before this, and had to some extent stopped the rebellion at least for some days. I met Riel the next morning, he said Nolin had not done as he promised and was to be executed. I asked for the chance to see him and told him Riel would shoot him, and I got him to make a retraction of what he had said against the movement; this was done to save his life. I never knew Nolin as a rebel; he always worked only in a constitutional manner. Before the rebellion actually broke out there was no question at all of taking up arms; we had only been agitating in a constitutional manner. Riel deceived us into the rebellion at the last moment, we the half-breeds had only intended acting in a constitutional manner and were drawn into the rebellion by Riel without the people there knowing the intention of Riel, or his personal purposes or ends. When Riel came that night of my arrival home, he said to me that 500 police were coming to exterminate us and our families and that he had called all the people together to see the baptism of Jackson, and that the 500 police were also coming to stop the ceremony.

Riel by the way he had acted for some months had got the people to believe that anything he would say would be sure to happen, he had such an amount of influence among the people that they thought that any thing they were told by Riel would happen. Riel by his ceremonies and mistatements about the outrages to be perpetrated by the troops or police held the people together at Batoche and kept his influence over the people. After the whole fight was over the half-breeds and I for one saw then that all the sayings of Rielwere untrue about our families or women being injured or hurt, and I after inquired about the 500 men Riel said were coming and I found it to be untrue; that none were coming as he had said and we then saw that we had been deceived by Riel into a trap. This was the only reason we had for taking up arms against the Government. I never saw any other reason except as stated to protect our wives and families from outrages, and Riel always told us there that when we took up arms we did so not against the Government but against the police. Riel said outrages were that we were to be massacred with our families and our race extinguished. I am unable to tell half the lies he told us. I have not been a very clever man but I am ashamed now to think that I have been misled by such lies and tricks. My idea at the time of the outbreak was to protect the lives of the prisoners who had been taken; their lives were really in danger after the battle at Duck Lake. When we crossed from Batoche to Duck Lake Riel told us we had to go to take possession of the houses there or else the police would come there and fight us from there. I was myself with the rest at Batoche and at the battles of Fish Creek and Batoche. After the rebellion I was taken with others to Regina and tried and sent to the penitentiary and released a short time ago. After the battle I came in alone to the General's camp and surrendered myself to him on the third day after. The letter to Crozier was to be delivered to Crozier or to some of his men at a rendezvous fixed."

And there is another affidavit, that of Pierre Parauteau:—

"During the rebellion I was named President but only acted twice and told them to choose a better man, and only carried arms two days. At Duck Lake I had only an old gun that would not fire. I never signed any of the papers for the Rebel Government, I've been told so but it is a lie. I only defended myself a little at the last fight at Batoche. I was taken to Regina and to the Penitentiary and returned a short time ago. I never took any of the goods or tobacco or anything from any of the stores. Riel told me that the soldiers were coming to kill our families and when I got to the church it was full. Riel deceived us, Riel told the people that the soldiers were coming to destroy us and that was the reason we fought, I am not aware of any other reasons. I am under oath and I know what I say; we fought only to save our lives and the lives of our families as Riel told us. Charles Nolin ran away from Duck Lake when the fighting commenced; before that he had been one of the leaders; if we had not been deceived as we were our men would not have taken arms at all.

Now Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, you will see from these affidavits that the policy of Riel there was to lead these people by fear to believe that the police and soldiers were coming to destroy them and that their lands were to be taken away and by that means they were trapped by him into the rebellion that unfortunately took place, but there is one fact and the challenge has been thrown out in Parliament over and over again without being accepted. But while it is said that their land was taken away from them and that colonization companies were formed and took the land, no man has been able to put his finger on a single acre of land occupied by a half breed that was taken by the Government from him. (Applause.) They said that they could not get patents but it is well known that the Government sent Mr. Duck to these people. They were asked to make the necessary entries but failed to do so and at an early period of this year I have myself as Minister of the Interior received petitions asking for another year's time in which to make the entries and I have granted it, but if they had been white settlers, equally as well off, their grants would have been forfeited to them. These are our principles with regard to our dealings with these Half breeds and if you were to go to-day among these Half-breeds and ask them what they thought of Louis Riel, I think you would be met, not with a look of sympathy for him, but by reproach from the one end of that country to the other. I have met them and they have presented addresses to me full of expressions showing their feeling of indignation against his conduct towards them in trapping them into this rebellion and in that having brought about the loss of lives, money and treasure which was so unfortunately incurred at that time. (Applause.)

These are the facts in regard to the hopes of the Liberal party of to-day in obtaining office, and they have tried many methods of obtaining office in this Dominion of Canada. In olden times they trusted to get office by raising up sectarian cries; the Roman Catholic religion was traduced and insulted; still they did not get office, and to-day we find them down upon their knees (in the hope that they might get office) to those whom they never ceased to oppose from the formation of their party to the present time. If you, ladies and gentlemen, could have accompanied me through the Province of Ontario during the last general election there or during the last local election in that Province, you could have heard denunciations of the French bleus from every platform, denunciation sung and said by Mr. Blake while going around to meetings accompanied by a fully organized choir and possibly also might be heard sung the ditties prepared by Mr. Edgar. If you could have seen that and you could realize to-day that their only hope of success in obtaining office for a time is to be found in perhaps the natural resentment of some in the Province of Quebec at the execution of Louis Riel, and you would come to realize how contrary to the old principles are the leaders of the party—and in that matter I should separate the leaders of the party from the party itself. I continue to say that the Liberals in this wide Dominion are deeply humiliated to think that their only chance of power is that they might get there through resentment for the execution of a man who happened to have French blood in his veins and because that fact has excited a sympathy throughout the Province of Quebec which they hope will result