

must not be forgotten—and if this House forgets the country will not—that many of these gentlemen who occupy positions in the North-West, were practically nominees of the gentleman who, in the vote that is about to be given, are themselves partially responsible for these appointments. I suppose there is no gentleman opposite who has not had, on some occasion, to intercede for some of those officials who are now practically on their trial. I think the Government ought to have exercised more than ordinary care for these wards of ours, who are so entirely dependent upon us. And under these circumstances, and in view of all the facts I have stated, I hold it is clearly proved that the Government has been culpably negligent in their treatment of the Indians in the North West.

Mr. CHARLTON. I merely rise to call attention to a charge made by the hon. gentleman for Leeds, (Mr. Ferguson) against a very respectable and highly esteemed clergyman of the Presbyterian Church. If these insinuations made by the hon. gentleman meant anything, he should have gone further, for, as the hon. member for Lambton says, either he said too much or too little. I think it is due to the Rev. Mr. Robertson, and due to this House, that the hon. member for Leeds should specify what the charges are that he insinuated against that gentleman. There is one feature of that gentleman's character that, I presume, would not commend itself to the hon. member for Leeds. He is, I believe, a Liberal, and has been for many years. Sir, the Rev. Mr. Robertson is a gentleman of the highest respectability. I have known him for over twenty years, have known him intimately. His position in the church is a high one, he has for many years been in charge of the Presbyterian Missions in the North-West, and in discharging those duties he has proved himself to be an efficient and an able man. It is to be regretted that such insinuations should be made against that gentleman, insinuations that leave us to imagine almost anything we please with regard to him. I claim on behalf of the reverend gentleman that is due to this House, to him, and to the country that we should know what the charges are against him; whatever the charge may be, let the hon. member from Leeds tell us what it is.

Mr. WATSON. I would not have spoken at this hour were it not for an insinuation that has been made on the other side of the House by the member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson) against the Rev. James Robertson, and also the insinuation made by the Minister of Public Works in reference to the Rev. John McDougall. Now, I consider that if there are two gentlemen in the North West who have rendered a service to this country in civilising the Indians, it is those two gentlemen. I was surprised to hear hon. gentlemen opposite slander them to-night. The Rev. Mr. Robertson I have known for the last ten years, and he is a man who is above reproach. He did not go to the North-West on the same mission as did the hon. member for Leeds, who has been slandering him; he did not go to the North-West for the purpose of having *bond fide* settlers' patents cancelled by his Government influence; but the Rev. Mr. Robertson went to the North-West for the purpose of doing good to the white settlers and the Indians. As to the Rev. Mr. McDougall, the Government were glad to recognise his valuable services during the troubles of last spring. He went amongst the Indians where the volunteers were afraid to go. He guided the volunteers from Calgary to Edmonton during the rebellion last spring, and I was surprised to hear the Minister of Public Works say that the Rev. John McDougall had made statements which he could not back up. I believe that gentleman has never made a statement that has reflected on the actions of the agents, that was not true; and I feel satisfied anything he has ever stated or wrote to the press, has been in the best interest of the North-West.

The Minister of Public Works also referred to the First Minister's pet, Mr. Dewdney, and said that he was always welcomed by the Indians wherever he went. Now, such is not the case. I believe there are gentlemen in this House who were present at an interview between Piapot and Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney, when Piapot, in council, told that gentleman to his face that he was a liar and a thief. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite call that reception a welcome reception, I fail to appreciate their judgment. There has been another reference made to the Chief Long Lodge. Now, I will repeat a statement made to me by a gentleman who was present at an interview between Mr. Dewdney and Long Lodge, at Qu'Appelle, some three years ago. Long Lodge visited Mr. Dewdney for the purpose of getting food for his family. He was fed at that time on what was well known as rotten pork. A contract was made for 45 tons of rotten pork. It is reported that pork was bought in Chicago for 1½ cent a lb, and sold to this Government for 19 cents; also that the Governor shared in the profits of the contract, but of this I know nothing. When Long Lodge went to get food for his family he stated to the Governor that one of his children had died the day before from starvation, and another was at the point of death, and unless he got fresh meat for his family he was afraid they would all die. He was a good Indian, an Indian who, a few years before, was in good circumstances, who had his ponies, his ammunition and game, and everything an Indian wanted on the plains. He was generous to all travellers whom he met, and was highly spoken of by the Mounted Police. He had accepted a treaty about two years before, and was compelled to go on his reserve, and we must all remember that an Indian placed on a reserve is something like a man in prison—he is not accustomed to it—that Indian was reduced to starvation by accepting a treaty from the Government, which was never carried out in good faith, and he went to the Lieutenant-Governor to ask for food to keep himself and family from starvation. And what was the reply? The reply was: "You have got to eat that pork or die." That was the reply of this great and good man, Governor Dewdney, who always treated the Indians kindly, and that same chief, Long Lodge, and three of his family did die shortly afterwards. They did not receive any other food. His reply to Mr. Dewdney was that he might as well feed his family on the poison with which they poisoned wolves as to feed them on that rotten pork. I fully endorse the statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and which have not yet been answered. I observed some hon. members taking notes, and I expected to hear them reply; but I suppose the charges and facts were such that they considered the best course to pursue was to leave them alone. I believe the charges are unanswerable, and cannot be sufficiently contradicted; and, feeling that such is the case, I shall support the amendment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I rise to a personal explanation. An hon. gentleman alluded to what I said with respect to Rev. Mr. McDougall. What I said, and what I intended to say, was this, that Mr. McDougall had made certain general charges, that when he was called upon to substantiate them and particularise them he was not ready to do so, and the investigation is going on.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Cameron, Huron:

YEAH:

Messieurs

Allen,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Auger,
Bain (Wentworth),
Bécharde,
Bergeron,

Dupont,
Edgar,
Fairbank,
Fisher,
Fleming,
Forbes,
Gaudet,

Langelier,
Laurier,
Lister,
McGraney,
McLuttre,
McMullen,
Mills,