

them have not yet been received. They are all in the vicinity of Prince Albert settlement, and in the country included between the north and south branches of the Saskatchewan, near their junction. The survey of the river frontage lots in that settlement, and also of the similar lots for half the settlement of St. Laurent on the south branch, was effected."

I think I have disposed of nearly the whole argument of the last speaker. But suppose, as the late Minister of the Interior said, that these surveys, although made as river lots in the beginning, had been resurveyed according to the rectangular system; suppose more than that, that these half-breeds had been treated purely and simply like white settlers, are we going to be told that these were grievances grave enough to justify an appeal to arms? Are you going to compare these grievances with the grievances of the French Canadians of 1837? Are you going to compare the present state of the French population in the North-West, where they number about 5,000 or 6,000 with the state of the French population in Lower Canada in 1837, when they were about half a million? Look at the grievances of the French Canadians in 1837, having a large majority in the Assembly, but being taxed by the Legislative Council and the Governor not responsible to the people. Is there any comparison between the two cases? There is nothing of the kind, and I repeat that, supposing the half-breeds had all the grievances which the hon. gentleman has mentioned—which they have not—they had no ground, no reason for a rebellion. If we were going to maintain the principle that the population under those circumstances would be justified in appealing to arms, I would like to know if the whole of this country would not have been justified in resorting to arms during the five years of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite from 1873 to 1878 not only a portion of the country, but from one end of it to the other. The last speaker says that the doings of the Mackenzie Administration had nothing to do with the question. Sir, that is not the way I intend to consider this question. I intend to examine the policy, the conduct, and the acts of the last Administration as well as of this one. What is the motion before the House? The motion is that the people have no confidence in the present Government, and they should give their confidence to the hon. gentlemen opposite; therefore I am bound to examine wherein the hon. gentlemen opposite would do better than this Government, and in order to ascertain that I must examine what they did when they were in power. In order to understand the bearings of this whole question it would be necessary to examine, first, the position of the country when the Canadian Government came in possession of it