

with having made sixty charges, fifty-nine of which were deliberate falsehoods and forgeries. If the statements made by these hon. gentlemen are true, I have no business to sit in Parliament: if they are not true, their duty is on the floor of Parliament to offer the humblest apology the English language will enable them to offer for having made use of language so unjustifiable under the circumstances. I propose to prove that the charges I made against the Administration were all true, with the exception of one, and that was substantially true. I will prove it, to the satisfaction of this House, many of whose members were in the old Parliament when I levelled that indictment of sixty charges against the Government. Fifty-nine of those charges, if their own reports are true, if the reports issued by the Department of the Interior and by their agents are true, are literally and absolutely true, if their blue-book which I hold in my hand is true. I will not deal with the whole sixty charges to-day: it is impossible. I will not venture to so weary the House or myself. I will take the first ten of those charges as published chronologically, in the order in which I treated them in my speech, and in which they were treated in the pamphlet issued in reply to my speech. I will then as occasion offers, because as far as I am able to do so I intend to put myself right before this country and before the members of this Parliament. I will fire at the heads of hon. gentlemen opposite the answers to those vile charges in batches of ten or fifteen at a time, and when I have got through, even the Minister of Justice will be satisfied that, to say the very least, he used indiscreet, unwise, unjustifiable language, and I have no doubt he will do more than that, he will express his extreme regret for having so done. I will show further that this pamphlet, issued I dare say under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior, who was then Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, is false from nearly the first page to the end. I will show that, to make a case against me, the pamphlet garbles the reports of the Department of the Interior, that it misquotes the reports, and the reports submitted to Parliament, and I will show that, in order to make a case against me, this pamphlet contains wilful and deliberate forgeries in answer to the charges I made against the Government. I will show that if these blue-books are true, if the returns are true, not only the returns which the hon. gentleman published in the blue-books but returns which the hon. gentleman had not the hardihood to publish in his own blue-books, they sustain every charge I made. Now, as to the first charge challenged, I did not give the language as a quotation from any report but as the substance of Agent McKay's report, and in doing so I made use of the following language:—

"A. McKay, an Indian agent at Grand Rapids, in his report states that the Inspector of Indian Agencies promised to supply them with all they might require, and that they were urged by that gentleman to make their demands on the department for the same, which they did, but they were not complied with. Mr. McColl, Inspector of Indian Agencies in the North-West, writing of the Swan Lake Bands, said that waggons were promised them and that he is apprehensive of serious consequences unless their claims are recognized."

What answer did this pamphlet and the Government make to that charge? The answer which the present Minister of the Interior, who at that time occupied, I believe, the position of Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories and Superintendent of Indian Affairs, ventured to make, not to a quotation from the report, but to the substance of the report which I ventured to submit to Parliament, is as follows:—

"In fact no such reports were ever made. A careful search through all Mr. McKay's reports fails to reveal any such statements as that attributed to the agent by Mr. Cameron."

Here is a direct issue: either the Government was mistaken and the pamphlet was mistaken in so answering my charges, or I was mistaken. Let us see where the responsibility lies. Will the Minister take the trouble to look at page 44 of the report of 1882? Did he ever read the reports of his department? Did he know what they contained? Did he venture to read the reports submitted by his own department before he made those charges against me: and before the Minister of Justice ventured upon the public platform to say that fifty-nine out of the sixty charges laid against the administration of Indian affairs in the North-West Territories were based upon deliberate falsehood and forgery, the Minister of Justice should have read the reports. I venture to say that the Minister of Justice never read one of them: he took the statements on trust, and he ventured to make those statements behind my back without verifying the correctness of the quotations I made in Parliament from the reports of the Indian Department. If the Minister of Justice will take the trouble to read the report, and if the hon. gentleman has not a copy of the report, I will lend him mine and point out the very paragraph. The substance of what I said can be found in the report sent in by Mr. McKay to the Indian Department. At page 44 of the Indian Report for 1882, the hon. gentleman will find the following words:—

"They stated that the Inspector of Indian Agencies promised to supply them with all they might require, and that they were urged by the gentleman to make their demands on the department for the same."

Then, if the hon. gentleman will turn to page 153 he will find what Mr. McColl said with respect to the waggons. He says:

"He is apprehensive of serious consequences unless their claims to their former possessions are immediately recognized by the Government, and the compensation of lands promised in lieu of waggons is granted them. * * * I consider that as the gardens are on a school section, and therefore not interfering with the claims of any settler, it would be advisable to adopt a conciliatory policy towards them by acceding to their request as far as granting the school section referred to, or a portion of it, to them in addition to the Swan Lake Reserve, to satisfy the promises made with regard to the waggons."

Now, I charged that these Indians were dissatisfied because you did not implement your own engagements with respects to the waggons. You said that the author of that speech was guilty of deliberate falsehood and forgery, but I have now read out of your own reports the identical words I made use of, although I did not pretend to give them in that statement as a quotation. Who is right and who is wrong? Is the Minister of Justice right who made these charges on the public platform, or is the individual right who is now addressing the House and who addressed it in 1886 upon the same subject? With respect to those charges I quote further the letter of Poundmaker to the present Minister of the Interior, in which he says:

"It is Poundmaker who takes the liberty of sending you a few lines. We entreat your Honour to send him the grist mill with horse power you kindly presented him at