

character they require a very large police force to secure obedience to the law and to prevent this country being involved in difficulties with our neighbors south of the border. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the police force being very hard worked in the North-West. They may be fairly actively employed, but I do not know that they have been overworked. We have not heard until now that the force has suffered in consequence of the laboriousness of their duties. At all events, if law and order exist in the North-West even in an ordinary degree it would not require such a large police force as the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill. At all events, we have not had the evidence before us. It must be an unusual condition of things that would require so large a force for the purpose of preventing thieving and plundering along the borders of the North-West and of Manitoba. I can easily understand how it is important that the Government should have a large force available in an emergency, a moderate police force with a large volunteer force in that country properly sustained, which would form a much stronger force than the Government propose to provide by this measure, and at very much less expense. For it only requires to look into our annual votes in order to satisfy ourselves that one policeman will cost nearly as much as twenty volunteers, and certainly more than a dozen, and surely in an emergency a dozen volunteers are of far more consequence to the country than a single policeman. I say, therefore, it does seem to me, on all the evidence we have as yet had from the Government, that one-half the policemen which the hon. gentleman proposed, supplemented when required by a large volunteer force established in the country, would provide much better protection against Indian risings, against the ordinary dangers such as have arisen there during the past three or four months, than the force which the hon. gentleman proposes to raise. Now, so far as the statement of the First Minister goes, this force is mainly required for the purpose of preventing complications arising between Canada and the United States, for the purpose of protecting the American people along the borders of Dakota and Montana from the settlers of Manitoba and the North-West. I say that before we undertake to make such an expensive provision to enable us to discharge our duties to our neighbors, we should have evidence that the wrong has been done. That we have not got. The information which would justify this measure is not yet before the House. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the House and the country should be put in possession of the information which would enable them to know the character of the population that the Minister of Agriculture has secured in the settlement of that country; that the Government itself should justify by the publication of that correspondence, the expenditure which this measure involves. Sir, the hon. gentleman does not seem to me to have at all answered the statements made by the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend has called the attention of the Government to the fact that the First Minister has undertaken to raise this force without the sanction of law, and during the period Parliament was sitting. The hon. gentleman says there was an emergency, and that it was in order to meet that emergency that he acted, relying upon the support of Parliament. That would have been the proper thing to do if Parliament had not been in session, and an emergency was present. But the hon. gentleman's action has taken place since the Session of Parliament began, and why then was not Parliament at once informed of the necessities of the position, and why did not the hon. gentleman, at the time such an emergency presented itself, call upon Parliament to give him authority to do what he is now asking Parliament to consent to. Sir, I think before this Bill is carried, and in fact before it proceeds further, the hon. gentleman should give us that infor-

Mr. MILLS,

mation, which verbally he has told us is the ground for his present action.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to state that I said that the white population along the border were a parcel of horse thieves. No expression of mine warranted the hon. gentleman in making that statement, or suggesting such a thing for a moment, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have so misrepresented what I stated. I said there were complaints on both sides of the line, but that I believed that though there were sins on our own side, there was much more on the other side—that we were more sinned against than sinning, though I did say that complaints were made that raids came from our own side. But, Sir, those raids can be done by British American Indians as well as by white men. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that though it would be a waste of time to lay them on the Table, I could show imploring petitions made by the citizens on our southern side, imploring that the policemen should come, that their cattle were stolen, and that raids were made upon them. Petitions were numerous in consequence of those raids. But there are complaints not only from the federal authorities of the other side, but from the magistracy and from the men commanding the troops on the other side, who are very good men. Whenever there is a statement that a raid has been made, whether by the Piegans, or the Bloods, or the white desperados who are strewed along the frontier and steal across from one side to the other, and are the terror of the people on both sides, they send the complaints at once, sometimes verbal, sometimes written, sometimes formal and official, and they are attended to. But in no way could any words of mine be tortured to mean that the white population as a whole, on the one side or the other, were a parcel of horse thieves.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are we to understand that there are complaints from the other side, through the British Minister?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, there have been complaints.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Do you intend to lay them on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that I do, as they would not really give much information. The practice is with the American Government, whenever a complaint is made, whether of a smuggling transaction, a seizure, or anything of that kind, they do not investigate it, but send it to the British Ambassador and throw the onus of enquiring into it upon the other. The parties probably send it to the Secretary of State; he sends it to the British Ambassador; he sends it to Canada. That is one cause of the complaints being numerous, because they do not investigate them themselves, but forward them to us to look into them.

Mr. ORTON. There is another misinterpretation of the language of the hon. Premier which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed—that is, that he said the Indians, as a body, were a pack of thieves. The First Minister did not say that; he said that there were amongst the Indians some who were lazy and who would steal.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that, nor did I say the First Minister said so. What I said was that the First Minister spoke of certain parties who would rather starve than work.

Mr. ORTON. We know that there are amongst the Indians in the North-West some who have remained loyal and true to the Crown, and it would be very wrong indeed that such a report should go abroad. We know that the Blackfeet, the Stoneys, and other tribes remained true, including many tribes in the neighborhood of Prince