

had in charge, that he is to go scathless because we may hold the Government primarily responsible. Sir, it is altogether beside the question to say that the present Minister of the Interior had no means whatever for seeing that the wrongs said to be inflicted upon the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan or elsewhere were brought to light and righted. It was his bounden duty, whether he had authority or not, on his own proper motion, to recognise those events, to make himself acquainted with the state of feeling from one end of that country to another; it was his bounden duty, if there was any wrong and injustice inflicted on those people, to call the attention of the Government of the day to those wrongs, and to do all that in him lay to have them righted. Some of the statements made by the First Minister do indeed go to show that it is possible—we have no means of judging of that at present—that the conduct of the Government, bad as we know it to have been, was infinitely worse than we had supposed it. If the present Minister of the Interior did his duty as he ought to have done; if the present Minister of the Interior kept the First Minister and the Government of which he was the chief, duly advised of the state of things and of the feeling existing on the banks of the Saskatchewan, if he warned them in good time of the risks they ran, of the danger of a revolt there, if he did his duty as the Premier appeared to imply he did, then these gentlemen opposite were ten times more guilty than any one has supposed them to be. We know they had warnings sufficient, that men of all sorts and conditions had, time after time, times without number, addressed appeals to these hon. gentlemen. Probably it is fair for us to suppose that when they received those appeals they applied to the officer in charge of that territory, that they asked him what he thought about it, what really was the state of the case. Up to the present statement, judging from the evidence laid on the Table of the House, we had a right to suppose, that the hon. gentleman pooh-poohed those reports, that he contributed to deceive and to blind the eyes of the Government. If it was otherwise, if he did his duty, if he warned them, if he corroborated those statements, then I say that the guilt of the Government is very great indeed on that account. Sir, how stands the case? We know this much: that a rebellion broke out three years ago on the banks of the Saskatchewan. We know that to suppress that rebellion we expended \$8,000,000 and, what was very much more important, sacrificed valuable lives, and to-day our pension list is there reminding us that there are many men maimed and disabled from one end of Canada to the other who rue the consequences of the neglect of the present Government. We know, Sir, that the Government had ample warning. But so far as the evidence before us goes, so far as the reports laid on the Table of the House by the Government in reply to the repeated demands made for information go to show, it appears, save only for the statement made by the Premier to-day, that the present Minister of the Interior, the Governor in charge of the territory, sent no warning, gave no notice, did nothing for his part to open the eyes of the Government to the dangers they were incurring. Here we find that after the rebellion had arisen under circumstances which, as I have said, amply warranted us in believing, up to the present moment at least, that the present Minister of the Interior had entirely failed in the discharge of his duties, we find that the man who next to the Premier of this Dominion was responsible in virtue of his office of Governor of that territory, that that man in whose time and under whose eye this rebellion sprung up is especially selected for reward. Sir, one of two things is perfectly clear: either the Minister of the Interior knew the state of the country and knew what was coming, or else the Minister did not know. If he knew it and if he failed to give information to the Government, then, Sir, there is no man here who will say

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that he was not guilty of a very great breach of duty. If, on the other hand, he was deceived, if with all the appliances and means for obtaining knowledge at his disposal, if with every opportunity for information, he failed to understand the state of things immediately under his own eye, I say from that fact alone, he is manifestly and evidently utterly unfit for the important position he now holds. And, Sir, in that case the appointment would be an insult, not only to the intelligence of the House, but an insult to every hon. gentleman who follows the First Minister on the other side.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps there was a third reason. May be it was his reward for keeping his mouth closed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend suggests there may be an explanation for all this, and no doubt not a few parties have suggested the same; that the Minister of the Interior had it in his power at the time, and has it in his power at the present moment, to prove that what we suspect is correct, and what the First Minister has almost admitted is correct, to prove that he gave ample warning, and to prove that the Government sinned against light and knowledge. To prove also, that the Government with wilful deliberation, almost I will say of set malice, brought about that unfortunate insurrection in the North-West. Sir, that is about the only explanation that can be given consistent with the circumstances of the extraordinary step that the hon. gentleman has taken. The one thing, Sir, that is perfectly clear in this matter is, that if the hon. gentleman deserves the encomiums which the First Minister has paid him, and if the hon. gentleman is really thoroughly fitted in all respects for his office, then, Sir, I repeat that it is impossible to over-estimate the misconduct of which the First Minister and his colleagues were guilty, after being warned by that authority, in allowing the rebellion to take place at all. Sir, I would like to know, are we to understand for the future, that the avenue on the part of governors for high promotion is that they should permit a rebellion to spring up in their territory? Are these rebellions the fruit of spontaneous combustion, or do they come from causes pretty well understood in this House? Do they come from the negligence, do they come from the corruption, do they come from the misconduct of the officials who receive our money and are responsible for the administration of the government of the country? Possibly it may be found that there is another lesson which is to be drawn from this remarkable appointment, and from some of the appointments that followed it, and I present it fairly to hon. gentlemen on the other side. Finding appointments of this kind made I would advise them all—and I think they have seen very good illustrations of the wisdom of the advice I am about to give them—I would advise them all to assert themselves, and not to sit down dumbly, and tamely, and allow such things to be perpetrated without expressing their opinions forcibly. I think, Sir, some of those hon. gentlemen have profited by the lesson, and I do think that others in the future will not be found slow to mark, and follow, and profit by it also. Under those circumstances I say this: I say that the Government, by their own act, are condemned; that the hon. gentleman who now sits in the position of the Minister of the Interior, if he be fit for his office, and if he did discharge his duty, if he did give warning, then, Sir, the severest things that have been said by my hon. friend, or any of his supporters as to the misconduct of the Government, are more than justified by the act of the Government itself.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt about who moved the adjournment of the House I beg to say that I did, and for harmony's sake I would withdraw the motion, as I consider quite enough has been said about it. I will say, before doing so, that I rather sympathise with the views expressed by the hon. gentleman on my