

**EARLY MEETING OF PARLIAMENT**

**Mr. FARROW** enquired whether it was the intention of Government in future to convene Parliament not later than the first of February, according to the promise given by the late government at the urgent request of the present.

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE:** The present Government never asked the late Government to do anything, but it is their intention to have Parliament convoked at an earlier period than of late, and if possible not later than the 1st February.

\* \* \*

**IMPROVEMENTS TO BE POSTPONED**

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE** stated that it was not the intention of the Government to get a vote this session for the improvement of one or more of the outlets of the Chevel and Lecarte, or otherwise improve the navigation between Lake St. Clair and the mouth of the River Sydenham, but before next session the matter would be considered by the Government.

\* \* \*

**INSOLVENT COMPANIES**

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK** asked whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce this session any measure to provide for the winding up of Insolvent Incorporated Companies.

**Hon. Mr. DORION** said that the measure which the Government would bring in would apply to all incorporated companies except banks, railway, and insurance companies.

\* \* \*

**THE NORTHWEST TROUBLES**

**Mr. SCHULTZ**, in moving a resolution for a Royal Commission to enquire into the Northwest disturbance, said the recent discussions of this House, as well as the indications of interest shown by the country generally through the press, proved the importance of the subject of which his motion treated. Perhaps no occurrence since Confederation had so engaged and agitated the public mind, and, so far from this interest having decreased, he believed it only to have changed to a general desire to have the causes of the occurrences of 1869 and the occurrences themselves thoroughly and impartially investigated, with a view to determining upon whom the responsibility for them rested, and with a view to preventing such occurrences in the future history of the settlement in the Northwest.

Hon. gentlemen in the recent debate had taken strong and opposite views as to these causes, and the very diversity of opinion expressed seemed to him to furnish an additional argument in favour of the necessity of the investigation which was the object of the motion. There were gentlemen in the House who believed, and who had expressed that belief in the recent debate, that the insurrection of 1869 was caused wholly by the ill-advised action of Canadians then in the country. He had himself asserted that the

insurrection was mainly consequent on the dissatisfactions which existed among the officers of the Hudson Bay Company.

The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Smith) had, while denying this assertion, offered no other explanation, but contented himself with making a violent personal attack on the "Member for Lisgar" (Mr. Schultz).

In regard to this attack he now took the first occasion which the rules of debate afforded him to not only protest against such an unmanly manner of discussing a grave question, but to offer a flat contradiction to the statements made by the hon. gentleman from Selkirk in regard to himself and express a hope that in the future the hon. gentleman would confine himself to the subject of debate, and, if he felt personal attacks to be actually necessary, he would do well to support his charges with at least some show of proof. Till then he dismissed those charges with the contempt such unfounded and unproven allegations deserved, and would go on to show why such an expression of opinion from the House such as his motion implied was necessary.

It might be argued, and possibly would be argued, that such an inquiry as was sought by this motion was now going on in the Select Committee moved for by the hon. member for Selkirk. It would be remembered, however, that this Committee had, by the motion which created it, three subjects under its consideration. One of these was investigation into the causes of the insurrection; another was the question of amnesty; and the third the reasons why the granting of that amnesty had been delayed. Owing to the limited number and the accessibility of the witnesses necessary on the two latter subjects, he had no doubt but that this Committee would be enabled to obtain such evidence as would enable them to report fully on that portion of the work entrusted to them; but, while he believed this, he was also satisfied that, on the subject of investigating the causes of the insurrection, it would be impossible for the hon. gentlemen who composed that Committee—no matter how desirous they might be of doing their duty—to bring before the House a report which would be comprehensive and impartial enough to do justice to the subject.

He felt satisfied, from the character of witnesses summoned from Manitoba to give evidence as to these causes, from the fact that the gentleman who moved for and was now the Chairman of this Committee belonged to that Company, the officers of which he (Mr. Schultz) accused of complicity with those who were concerned in the rebellion of 1869, and from the fact that the interval till the close of the session would not be sufficient to supplement the witnesses now here with others from Manitoba who were not concerned in the rebellion itself or the Provisional Government which followed it, that the report of this Committee under the circumstances could not possibly be of a satisfactory and impartial nature.

In view of these facts, he was in favour of a Royal Commission. In the first place as it would hold its sittings in the Province where the disturbances occurred, and it would be in a position to take evidence from persons of all shades of political opinion and from representatives of all classes, nationalities and creeds. It could