

DEBATES
OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS,
OF THE
DOMINION OF CANADA.

REPORTED AND EDITED BY A. M. BURGESS.

VOL. I.—SESSION 1875.



Ottawa :

PRINTED BY C. W. MITCHELL, "FREE PRESS" OFFICE, ELGIN STREET.

1875.

arrangement is being made which will, I hope, obviate the inconvenience complained of.

CORRECTION OF HANSARD REPORTS.

The Orders of the Day having been called,

Mr. MASSON said he desired to call the attention of the Printing Committee to a subject in connection with the printing of the Official Report of the debates, which was of great importance, seeing that this report would be regarded as an authoritative one for all time. He referred to the necessity of providing some means whereby any mistakes that might be made could be corrected. He fully appreciated the difficult and onerous duties which devolved upon the short-hand-writers, and as regards himself he had only a trifling error or two to complain of, but it was as well to provide for correcting mistakes, as more serious errors might occur in the future. He had been made to say in the Hansard report—"Notwithstanding the humiliation that he will have to bear, whether he remains patriot in his country or an exile forever;" whereas what he did say was—"Whether he remains a Pariah in his country." Then he held that when an interruption was made to a speaker that interruption should be reported, or otherwise the remarks which would follow would not have their full force and meaning. For instance he was reported to have said,—“Notwithstanding the verdict of a packed jury—I hold myself responsible for every word I say.” That expression standing alone appeared like boasting. He had said, “I hold myself responsible for every word I say,” because some members of the House had cried, “no, no,” and “hear, hear.” These were small mistakes, and he probably would not have called attention to them were it not to suggest the necessity of providing some means whereby mistakes which might occur might be corrected before the reports were distributed.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said it would be remembered that this matter was referred to the Printing Committee which was not yet organized. As soon as they met they would no doubt submit some regulations respecting the correction of speeches. The practice in England had been to allow verbal corrections, but no interpolations. He did not make any suggestion to the

Hon. Mr. Cartwright.

Committee, but he had no doubt they would bring the matter before the House at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) said his attention had been called to some typographical errors in the report, but no regulations could be made until the Committee met. All that so far had been done was to agree that the speeches should be printed, so far as was necessary, in order to comply with the terms of the contract, and at the same time be condensed in such a manner as not to destroy the meaning of any speech. No doubt when the Committee met they would take the matter into consideration, and he hoped that in the future there would be no cause for complaint.

THE NORTH-WEST TROUBLES.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he rose with great willingness in one sense, and a good deal of tremor in another sense, to move the resolution of which he had given notice respecting the granting of an amnesty for acts committed during the troubles in the North-West. He hoped to be able to justify to the House the course which the Government had pursued in this matter, as he did not doubt he would be able to justify it to the country. He was quite aware that there were certain parties who might endeavour for political and party purposes to make capital out of the existing events, and so far as that was legitimately done he had no reason to complain. He expected no exemption from ordinary criticism, and he was quite prepared to defend the motives and the action of the Government in everything that they brought before the House. They had at present to deal with an exceptional state of affairs—one that perhaps might not arise again in the lifetime of any of the members—and that state of affairs had been brought about by no action of the present Government, or of a single member of it, or of a single member of the great Party which he was privileged to lead in this House. But for all that the Government, as a Government, had a duty to perform. There might be frequent changes of administration in the country, but the Government always exists, and is bound to carry on the affairs of the country consistently with those principles of honor and national character which bind every Administra-

tion, no matter of what Party they may be composed. When the events took place in the North-West, which had given rise to the discussion preceding this motion, and which furnished the necessity for this motion at the present time, the right hon. gentleman opposite had taken certain steps in reference to the acquisition of the North-West, and to the organisation of its Government, which were not sanctioned by the then comparatively small party in this House—the Liberal party. That party then held that the measures that were being taken by the Government for organizing that territory, were such as were sure to produce a certain measure of discontent. He did not allege that as a justification for succeeding events, because he considered that no mere act or fault on the part of the Government of the day could have justified the insurrection and its consequences. But while the thing might not be justified, there might be palliations afforded by circumstances which they were bound to consider, and in the consideration of this motion, he was bound to refer to the provocation which the people in the North-West Territory had received for resisting what they considered a grievous act on the part of the Government of this country. So far as that resistance was of a peaceful and not violent kind, he confessed he had himself some sympathy with them; and he also confessed that had their acts been confined to expressing a strong sense of their indignation at certain things that were done, they would have found, perhaps, a very general response in the hearts of members of the then House, as they would have found in the present House, but these acts were followed up by acts of lawless violence—acts which he had previously characterized in this House, and which he did not hesitate now to characterise as he had then done—acts entirely at variance with all that seemed to him right—acts of cruelty and wrong which he did not at this moment desire at all to palliate. But succeeding events had changed very materially the relations of that people to the people of this country, and to the Government of the Dominion—it was supposed by many—he did not say it was the case, because he never could believe that it could be so. It was believed by many, and said by some in this House,

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

that there was a preconcerted arrangement with the then Administration as to certain events which took place; but up to the time that Committee met on the North-West difficulties last session, we had no detailed account of events in anything like consecutive order; nor had we a revelation of the private correspondence which was ultimately produced upon that day in order to express more fully the motives as well as the actions of those who ruled here, and of those whom they sent to represent them there. That revelation was sufficiently complete for the purpose of an ultimate decision being arrived at when that Committee rose. The late Administration referred the whole subject, on the 4th June, 1873, to the Imperial Government, representing that it was the best qualified to deal with this question of amnesty. Lord KIMBERLEY, in his reply, combatted this idea, but accepted the responsibility of granting the amnesty, provided that no action would be taken until the precise course to be pursued by the Dominion authorities was made known. This was the last action of an official nature by the late Government, and when the present Administration consented to the motion of the hon. the member for Selkirk for a committee of enquiry, it was with the view of obtaining all the information possible in order to enable them to arrive at a proper decision in the premises. He had not himself been able, from the pressure of the business of the House, to give any attention to the deliberations of the Committee during the session, and except from occasional scraps of conversation, he was not able to obtain what had really been done during the sitting. When the entire evidence was printed, however, it became tolerably clear that nothing was more natural than that the Imperial Government should obtain a copy of the testimony as early as possible, and that they should again be solicited to pass judgment upon the case with the whole of the facts before them. This course the present Administration took, and as would be seen by the Order in Council which was before the House, they again called the attention of the Imperial Government to the subject. The answer to that communication was practically given in Lord CARNARVON'S despatch in which there were several points that he

would now desire to call the attention of the House to—not perhaps in their proper consecutive order, but in such a way as to lay the whole subject before the House as shortly, and at the same time, as fairly as possible. He believed there was no necessity for any lengthened exposition of the matter, and besides he was afraid that his voice would fail him before he got through. The first step he conceived to have been wrong on the part of the late Administration was the recognition of the authority of the insurrectionary party of Manitoba. That authority once recognized, the Government was placed in the difficulty he foresaw at the time, and to which he called the attention of the right hon. member for Kingston at the time. It would be remembered that he then asked the right hon. gentleman if the Government intended to recognize the delegates, and was told in reply that the Government were bound to hear the expression of opinion of any one who came from that country, but they need not formally recognize them as coming from the Provisional Government. He found, however, that they had given this recognition, and we had the fact laid before us in the letter of the late Hon. Mr. HOWE, addressed to Father RICHOT, Mr. JOHN BLACK and Mr. ALFRED SCOTT, as follows:—

“OTTAWA, April 26th, 1870.

“GENTLEMEN,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd instant, stating that as delegates from the North-West to the Government of the Dominion of Canada, you are desirous of having an audience with the Government, and am to inform you in reply that the Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD and Sir GEO. ET. CARTIER have been authorized by the Government to confer with you on the subject of your mission, and will be ready to receive you at eleven o'clock.

“I have the honor to be,

“Gentlemen,

“Your most obdt. servant,

“(Signed,) JOSEPH HOWE.”

Not only was the existence of the Provisional Government recognized in this matter, but it was an absolute fact that the authority of RIEL himself as Governor of the territory, was also acknowledged, if we were to believe the evidence set before us. There was no reason to doubt the entire truthfulness of the ARCHBISHOP in giving his evidence. In the first place because of his high ecclesiastical position and personal character, and in the

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie,

second place because there was no motive to justify any misrepresentation upon the subject. The ARCHBISHOP said, as will be found on page 77 of the blue book:—

“I then asked Sir GEORGE who was to govern the country, pending the arrival of the Lieut. Governor, and if he was to name somebody to do so. He answered, “No, let Mr. RIEL continue to maintain order and govern the country as he has done up to the present moment.”

Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD enquired what the date of the interview was?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said it was the 28th May, at all events the date was a small matter, as the circumstance referred to took place after the military expedition had been determined upon, and in the interval between the starting of the expedition and the assumption of temporary authority by General WOLSELEY, pending the arrival of Governor ARCHIBALD. The evidence goes on to say:—

“He asked me if I thought that RIEL was sufficiently powerful to maintain order. I said I thought he was. Then he answered, “Let him continue till the Governor arrives.” He also inquired whether Mr. RIEL would require that the Governor should take authority as his successor. I answered that he would not; that his Government was only a provisional one, and that he would immediately withdraw when the representative of HER MAJESTY arrived. “Very well,” said Sir GEORGE; “let him be at the head of his people to receive the Governor.”

This gentleman who had usurped authority, and whom the right hon. gentleman opposite some years after this was exceedingly anxious to catch, was apparently duly authorized by Sir GEORGE CARTIER to continue the administration of the affairs of the country as Governor, and was asked through the ARCHBISHOP to meet the new Governor and receive him at the head of his people. The House might be told, and he had no doubt would be told, that Sir GEORGE CARTIER, who unfortunately was not here, had no authority to speak on behalf of the Administration. In order to place this beyond dispute, we had only to refer to Sir JOHN MACDONALD's own evidence. He said that the correspondence relating to the North-West, of a confidential and inconfidential character, were carried on with Sir JOHN himself until his illness, after which they were carried on with Sir GEORGE CARTIER. During the examination before the Committee, it transpired that there was a private memoranda written by Sir GEORGE CARTIER, and

signed by HIS EXCELLENCY, in regard to which the right hon. member for Kingston had addressed HIS EXCELLENCY, suggesting that it might be published. In reply, he received a communication from HIS EXCELLENCY, in which the passage occurs :—

"As, however, Sir GEORGE is dead, and as he drew up the memorandum in question in his capacity of Acting Minister of Justice, and as your *locum tenens* during your absence and illness, I believe I shall be acting in accordance with the rule recognized under such circumstances, in granting the permission you seek, to have the document in question communicated to the Committee, for which I have therefore given the necessary directions."

That clearly disposes of two points—in the first place that there was an actual recognition of a *de facto* Government. Lord CARNARVON tells us that there can be no such thing as a recognition of a *de facto* Government within HER MAJESTY'S dominions. Technically, perhaps constitutionally, this may be right; still it is not to be denied that these people exercised authority, and were the *de facto* Government of the country, although legally and constitutionally they had no right to appear there in that character. But they found the Administration, who were responsible for the peace of the country, acknowledging the existence of this Government by, in the first place, formally recognizing their delegates and conferring with them; and, secondly, by the acting PREMIER actually giving directions that the President of the Provisional Government should hand over his authority in person to the LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR when he should reach that country. Now, it was tolerably evident that when these transactions were occurring—he meant these conversations with Sir GEORGE CARTIER and ARCHBISHOP TACHE—it was quite evident that everything connected with the death of SCOTT was perfectly known and understood; the responsibility for it could not be shifted, none of the incidents connected with the tragic death of SCOTT could be changed for a moment, and Sir GEORGE CARTIER, during this time, was acting with the perfect understanding that this matter had to come up sooner or later. Now, they found, as one of the next incidents, that promises of amnesty were given most profusely. It was true that Lord CARNARVON and HIS EXCELLENCY in his despatches both asserted that there was no proof in

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

these documents of "promise of amnesty having been made—an absolute promise, either by HER MAJESTY'S Imperial representative or those acting for him here." Now, while this was technically true to some extent perhaps—it was true so far as Sir JOHN YOUNG was concerned—it was a mere evasion of the truth to say no promise was made in any quarter that an amnesty was to be given. The evidence in this point was so abundant that he would be under the necessity of reading extracts from it, in order to lay the exact facts before the House. Now, one word before proceeding to read the evidence of promises made by gentlemen administering the Government. It was quite true what was said in the Imperial despatch of HIS EXCELLENCY that such promises would not bind the Imperial Government, but he (Mr. MACKENZIE) conceived it was not to be said that promises made in this matter by the previous Administration, sustained by the previous Parliament, must not command a certain amount of respect from the present Administration and the present Parliament. On the contrary, he thought they were bound, as HIS EXCELLENCY EARL DUFFERIN laid down, to consider these promises. He would paraphrase the passage from the blue book: "We are bound to consider all such promises; not to have them made binding upon the House merely in a technical sense, but to give them a fair and literal interpretation." This Government was equally responsible, in one sense, for the conclusion of present affairs, with the Imperial Government, and this Government was bound from its knowledge of the local circumstances when perhaps the Imperial Government would not feel itself so bound. He would feel, therefore, under the necessity of proceeding to quote from the evidence laid before the House in the blue book. Bishop TACHE left Rome early in January at the instance of the Dominion Government, in order to proceed on a mission of pacification to the North-West. He left unwillingly, because he considered he had not been very kindly treated on his way from that country to the East at the time when the disturbances were anticipated, but had not actually broken out. Bishop TACHE in his evidence before the North-West Committee, published in page 39 of the blue book, says :—

"In my conversation with him I questioned Sir GEORGE CARTIER about Father RICHOT'S report. I stated as fully as possible what Father RICHOT had told me, and Sir GEORGE CARTIER said that is exactly what has taken place. Directly afterwards I said to Sir GEORGE CARTIER, that Father RICHOT had stated to me that when he was with the delegates of the Government, Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD and Sir GEORGE CARTIER, who had been appointed to negotiate with the delegates of the North-west, he brought forward the 19th clause of the Bill of Rights, and stated it was the *sine qua non* of an agreement between them and the Canadian Government. The delegates of the Government answered the North-west delegates, that the thing would be settled afterwards, and that it was the privilege of HER MAJESTY the QUEEN, and not for the Canadian Government to grant an amnesty. The delegates of the Provisional Government replied, "We are come to treat with you, and are to decide with you what course is to be taken." Then Sir GEORGE CARTIER or Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said: "We will show you how to proceed to obtain what you require." "No," replied Mr. RICHOT, "I am to deal with nobody but you. If you are not in a position to decide the whole matter, I will go home. I came to settle the difficulty with the Government, and having received my instructions, I cannot proceed except the proposals are in accordance with the instructions I have received." Then the delegates of the Government answered Mr. RICHOT and the other delegates of the North-west, that they were in a position to guarantee the granting of an amnesty, and to assure them that the amnesty would be proclaimed, and would reach the country before they did. They further said that they would wait till the passing of the bill they were going to prepare, before they made the proclamation.

"The delegates from the North-West considered there was nothing further to be done upon this point. That is what I reported to Sir GEORGE as having been the statement of Father RICHOT to the people of Manitoba. Sir GEORGE said: "That is true; the thing has not been changed. We are waiting for the proclamation every day, and if you remain for a few weeks, it will arrive before you leave."

He proceeds:

"Sir GEORGE CARTIER was in Montreal, and Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD was sick and could not attend to business. So next morning I started for Montreal, where I saw Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER; I had many interviews with him, and I asked him if the report of Father RICHOT was correct, and he said it was."

Sir JOHN MACDONALD desired the hon. gentleman to mention to the House the fact that he (SIR JOHN) was taken ill on 6th May, and was ill all summer.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—I am quite aware of that, and if the hon. gentleman merely wishes to avoid personal responsibility—

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—No, no; I want the fact stated.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE, in reply, said he had stated at the early part of his remarks that Sir GEORGE CARTIER was formally, and by seniority in the Council, appointed and entitled to act as the *locum tenens* of the Premier. There was another point. It was said—supposing it were true that a promise of amnesty had been made. Was that promise to cover everything? It must be noticed that when this conversation took place, SCOTT had been dead for several months, and all the events were known. But the truth was that before Archbishop TACHE went up at all, he claimed in his evidence that he was authorized to offer an amnesty for proximate events, as he appeared to have pointed out that it was quite possible that something might happen before he could reach there. Archbishop TACHE said, on page 18:

"I understood from the tenor of the conversation that the amnesty would apply to acts committed after that date (I mean the date of the conversation) as well as before; in fact that it should apply to all acts up to the time of my arrival, provided that the people should consent to unite with Canada. One of the ministers, Sir GEORGE CARTIER, said to me:—"The Government has made many mistakes, and we cannot be surprised that the population should make some mistakes upon their side. Assure them that the disposition of the Government towards them is such that they may rely upon us with perfect security."

Now, on the same page, the evidence proceeded:

"Any other conversation I had was with Sir JOHN MACDONALD, who again impressed me with the necessity of informing the people of the good intentions of the Government towards them. I said to him then, "This is all very well, but there have been acts committed which are blameworthy, and there may be some others before my arrival there. May I promise them an amnesty." He answered me:—"Yes, you may promise it to them." I subsequently asked him to give me in writing the substance of the conversation that had passed between us. This was before I left Ottawa. It was then that Sir JOHN MACDONALD wrote me the letter dated the 16th February, 1870."

That letter would not be found to carry out the *ipsissima verba* of that report of the conversation. There was another remarkable matter connected with this point of the subject. The ARCHBISHOP, after going up to the North-West, acting as the delegate of this Government, returned to Canada, and it was after he

came back that some of the conversation took place. He was invited by Sir GEORGE CARTIER to accompany him to Niagara. They travelled a certain distance together. It was pressed on the ARCHBISHOP that it would be better for him to pass through the States; he landed at Oswego, travelled overland to Buffalo, and went from Buffalo to Niagara. While at Niagara he endeavored to obtain the assurance of HIS EXCELLENCY the GOVERNOR-GENERAL in the sense of confirming the promise he had obtained from HIS EXCELLENCY'S advisers, and it was while there he obtained the first hint, he tells us, that, even if an amnesty should be proclaimed, it was likely that a distinction must be made between some of those concerned in the Red River difficulties. He said in his evidence:—

I drew the attention of Sir GEORGE CARTIER to this observation of Mr. TURVILLE'S. I took him aside, and said: "What is the meaning of this?" Sir GEORGE CARTIER replied, "Mr. TURVILLE is a nice man, but he knows nothing about these matters, so you need not be uneasy about what he says." That satisfied me that the amnesty had not been withdrawn, but the statement gave me a little uneasiness on that point. So afterwards, when I again met Sir GEORGE, I again spoke about Mr. TURVILLE'S observation, when he gave me about the same answer, and assured me there was no danger to be apprehended for any one of those concerned in the troubles. He also assured me that the amnesty would come soon, and that it would be of an absolute and general character." Father RICHOT'S evidence was also exceedingly explicit upon this point. He said:

"I left Red River on the 24th of March, 1870, [this was twenty days after the murder of SCOTT], and arrived in Ottawa on the 11th April. We had interviews with two members of the Canadian Government, who were delegated by their colleagues to treat with us.

Father RICHOT next spoke of the interview, and said:

"I was in company with Mr. BLACK. This was on the 23rd. The amnesty was then treated of. We treated of matters in general, but I said the first thing was the amnesty, and that without it nothing could be done. Sir JOHN was present at the time. The hon. gentleman told me that the amnesty did not rest with Canada, but that they would find means to arrange the matter. Sir GEORGE said these were only preparatory interviews with a view to arranging the matter."

Further on witness proceeds:

"I was with Mr. BLACK; Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD and Sir GEORGE CARTIER were present. The interview took place at Sir GEORGE'S house. They told me these interviews were

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

semi-official. The hon. gentleman wished on that day to treat for arrangements, but I refused, complaining that I had no written acknowledgment of my position as delegate, and I desired to know with whom I was to communicate. I desired to know how I was looked upon. The hon. gentleman said I was sufficiently recognized by what had taken place and what had been said in the House. I then insisted on having a written acknowledgment of my status. The amnesty was spoken of on the 25th."

It would be observed by the House that Mr. HOWE'S letter was dated 26th April, thus showing that the Government, in the first place, endeavored to treat with the delegates without recognizing their status, but Father RICHOT insisted on that being done prior to negotiations being entered upon. Accordingly, Mr. HOWE wrote the letter of the following day. Father RICHOT, in his evidence, said:—

"I said we might speak on it, but we could settle nothing definitely as to that matter. I said the *sine qua non* of an agreement was a general amnesty. The Hon. Ministers said they would give me an answer on the following day. They also said we give you the means of obtaining an amnesty, but they did not state positively what those means were."

On page 71 of the blue book Father RICHOT'S evidence is as follows:

"The Minister said in reply to our questions that they were in a position to assure us that an amnesty would be granted immediately after the passing of the Manitoba Bill. The nineteenth clause of our instructions is as follows:—

"That all debts contracted by the Provisional Government of the Territory of the North-West, now called Assiniboia, in consequence of illegal and unconsidered measures adopted by Canadian Officials to bring about a civil war in our midst, be paid out of the Dominion Treasury; and that none of the Members of the Provincial Government or any of those acting under them be in any way held liable or responsible with regard to the movement or any of the actions which led to the present negotiations."

That 19th clause was referred to in Father RICHOT'S evidence as the *sine qua non*. He then proceeds:

"I asked that this clause should form part of the Bill, but they replied that it was not expedient that it should form part of the Bill, inasmuch as the Bill belonged to the House, while the amnesty was a matter for the administration. I asked for a written assurance, but they answered that it was not necessary, and that we might trust to their word. They also said there would be no difficulty whatever, with regard to the amnesty, and that it was a matter which rested with the Crown. We then went on discussing the other matters of our mission. That was all that was then said with regard to the amnesty. They did not speak at all with regard to the proclamation of December 6th, 1869. They told me it would be an insult to

HER MAJESTY if they gave me a written guarantee. They said that if a written promise of the amnesty were required before the passing of the Manitoba Bill it would be imposing conditions on the Crown."

The witness goes on to state :

"The next interview was on the 30th. The three delegates met Sir GEORGE CARTIER; Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD was still ill. We spoke of the amnesty. Immediately after the interview I took notes of what had been said. I made notes after all our interviews. The note referring to the interview of the 30th is as follows:—"A word about the amnesty all in the same sense." I remember Sir GEORGE told me not to be uneasy, for everything would be granted as it had been promised."

Again he says :

"After the interview with the GOVERNOR GENERAL and Sir CLINTON MURDOCH, I had an interview with Sir GEORGE CARTIER, who asked me if I had not been content with the results of the interview which I had just had with His EXCELLENCY and Sir CLINTON. I told him I was sufficiently pleased if what they stated regarding the granting of the amnesty were put in writing. Sir GEORGE then replied the British Government and the Government of Canada would treat our people like spoiled children, and give them more than they expected."

Then, further on, there is the following evidence on page 77, as part of the conversation that took place during the interview on the 28th :

"The *resume* of what Sir GEORGE told me is this, "You have obtained all you desired; your amnesty will be proclaimed; it will be there before the LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR arrives. In the meantime tell your people "to remain quiet and to fear nothing. * * * I told him that I had expected myself to bring a proclamation of amnesty with the Manitoba Act. He told me that what I had was equivalent to the proclamation of an amnesty, as an amnesty would arrive before any other authority in the North-West, and that meanwhile RIEL was master and had nothing to complain of. I saw Sir GEORGE several times. He said he had a very plain reason for not giving me any more definite written statements, which was that the Canadian Government could not give the amnesty themselves; that the proclamation of the Governor was sufficient, and that he could not give a better one. The reason he gave me to sign the petition myself to the QUEEN, was in order that the Government and the Governor might not be compromised. He told me that on account of the excitement of feeling it was advisable to take all the means possible, which would arrive at the same end without exciting prejudices; that in a country like this, where there were different interests and several parties, provided you arrived at the same end, it was advisable to take those means which would least run counter to the opinions of some of the people. That secondly, the means he was taking to have the amnesty proclaimed was the safest and quickest way of obtaining the desired result without

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

creating dissatisfaction; that by all that had occurred in our interviews, I should see that their own interests more than ours were to have an amnesty proclaimed; that they had commenced the grand work of Confederation; that without amnesty all their work would be lost, and that the people in the North-West were to remain tranquil until the amnesty should arrive."

"I told Sir GEORGE that I believed what he said, but was very anxious to have it believed up there. Then he said, "Assure RIEL and his followers that the amnesty will certainly be granted, and that if he wishes to reflect he will see that we have more interest than he in granting the amnesty."

Mr. MACKENZIE said he must apologize to the House for entering so much into detail, but he wished to point out that it was not a stray expression, not a mere remembrance of words dropped in conversation, but by a continuous line of conversations and successive and continuous interviews, it was the sole subject of discussion; that there was no possibility of being mistaken, and that the evidence showed conclusively that those people were led to believe that what they asked would undoubtedly be granted. But besides, we have in Father RICHOT's affidavit, sworn on 19th November, 1873. He says:—

"On the 26th April, 1870, the negotiations were begun by taking into consideration the list of rights brought by the delegates, and which has served as the basis for the Manitoba Act; that besides the Manitoba Act, &c., agreeably to the nineteenth section of the list of rights, the delegates demanded, as a *sine qua non* of the arrangements, a general amnesty for all acts done or authorized by the Provisional Government."

And then he declares in the affidavit:—

"That the Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD and Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, after stating that the amnesty did not rest with the Government of Ottawa, declared that they were in a position to assure us that it was the intention of HER MAJESTY to grant the amnesty, and that they would take upon themselves to proclaim it, that in fact it would be proclaimed immediately after the passing of the Manitoba Act."

He merely quoted that affidavit although it was a repetition of the evidence given by Father RICHOT, in order to show that when under oath that reverend gentleman made precisely the same statement as when he gave his evidence. Then the House had a corroborative statement in the evidence of Mr. GIRARD. It would be observed that the delegates, returning to Manitoba, proclaimed far and near to their people, in order to reassure them,

the good intentions of the Government towards the people of the North-West; that the promise of amnesty was as full and complete as anything could be, and there was no reason to doubt the good faith of the Government in the matter. Mr. GIRARD, after stating that he wrote to Sir GEORGE CARTIER in the Fall of 1870, proceeded to say:—

"In these letters I described the condition of the country, and urged strongly upon Sir GEORGE the necessity for an amnesty.

"I received answers to several of these letters—I think to all of them. His answer was to request me to be sure that the amnesty would come. Tell your people to remain quiet and keep order.

"I wrote to Sir GEORGE as well in my capacity of a minister as the sole representative of the French element; and also as a friend. I have not those answers from Sir GEORGE here; they are at Winnipeg. In these letters to me he remarked also when recommending quiet, that the enemies of the people would be gratified if they put themselves in the wrong by acting otherwise, and so deprive themselves of the benefit of their position. He desired me to tell them to adhere to their duty and that the amnesty would inevitably come."

At the same interview, promises were made with respect to the expenditure by the insurrectionary leaders, and there was no question now of the fact that the late Administration did promise absolutely to pay the Hudson's Bay Company for all the stores which were seized by the leaders of the insurrection during their short reign.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—No. If the Hudson's Bay Company should set up any claim for payment of stores, then the Government would stand between the insurgents and all harm.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—The Company has set up a claim, and perhaps the hon. gentleman would state who had to stand between the parties now. If the hon. gentleman had no regard for his political promises, he (Mr. MACKENZIE) must have regard thereto. Here were the expressions that Archbishop TACHE stated to have been used to him:—

"Should the question arise as to the consumption of any stores or goods belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company by the insurgents, you are authorized to inform the leaders that if the Company's Government is restored, not only will there be a general amnesty granted, but in case the Government should claim the payment for such stores, that the Canadian Government will stand between the insurgents and all harm.

But who was to stand between the Treasury and all harm? Would the leader of

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

the Opposition do so? Mr. GIRARD, speaking of Sir GEORGE CARTIER's letter to him about the amnesty, said:

"I was then engaged in my election, and I made those communications very generally known among the people, as well in my county as elsewhere. I made extracts from these letters and circulated them among the people; and I consider that they had a powerful effect in calming the people, and preserving peace and good order. I think I can find these letters, and, if I can, I will transmit them to the Chairman."

With regard to the effect produced by the promises made, Archbishop TACHE stated in his letter to Sir JOHN YOUNG, of date 23rd July, 1870:

"The promise of an amnesty has largely contributed to obtain the result secured; had I not been convinced myself that an amnesty would be granted; had I not brought the people to partake of my conviction, the mission intrusted to me by the Government of YOUR EXCELLENCY would certainly not be crowned with the success obtained."

There was another phase of this matter which he proposed to deal with. It would be recollected that the right hon. gentleman opposite made a pilgrimage through Ontario in 1873. It was not, to be sure, a very successful one; on the contrary it was very disastrous to him. During that pilgrimage he (Mr. MACKENZIE) was accused of making capital out of the execution of SCOTT. He declared that he never did make capital out of it. He had expressed his honest conviction in Parliament and out of it, as he was prepared to do on all occasions and on every topic. Gentlemen would search his speeches in 1872 in vain for anything to prove that charge. But what was the course of the right hon. gentleman opposite? Why, as he went west his language became bolder, and he was able at last when he reached the western confines of Ontario, to characterize the execution of SCOTT as a murder, and to express his anxious desire to catch the murderer that he might be punished. Let us see what took place. The general election of 1872 began in August and continued well on in September. In December, 1871, we find the hon. gentleman opposite proposed to Mr. RIEL, through the Archbishop, that he should leave the country, and he (Sir JOHN) would pay him \$1,000. The ARCHBISHOP, in his evidence before the North-west Committee, states:

"I came to Canada October 5th, 1871. I saw Sir GEORGE in Montreal and Quebec, and he

spoke to me about RIEL's leaving the country, and he strongly advised me to use my influence to get RIEL to leave the country for a while. This was in October or November, 1871. I told Sir GEORGE that I agreed in his opinion, but that it was extremely difficult for me to interfere, as I had been so badly treated, being deceived about the amnesty. He urged me, saying, "I was the pastor of the people," and he insisted so much, that I at last said I would try, but I said, "You must remember that man is poor; his mother is a widow with four young girls and three young boys, and she has no means of support, especially when her eldest son is away. He himself has only labor for his support, and I do not think it is fair to ask him to leave his home without some compensation or some means of travelling." "That is true," said Sir GEORGE, "we will see about that." He then asked me if I would go to Ottawa. "Yes," said I, "I intend to be there the beginning of December." "Then," said he, "we will settle the matter there." I came to Ottawa the beginning of December. Sir GEORGE also came, and then I saw him and Sir JOHN. I had several conversations with both of them, but one of them especially I remember with Sir JOHN; it was on the 7th December, about noon, in his office. I do not remember who began, but he insisted that I should advise RIEL to leave the country for a while, and added these words, so far as I can recollect them: "If you can succeed in keeping him out of the way for a while, I will make his case mine, and I will carry the point." The question of amnesty has caused me so much pain already that I thought I would be justified in using all honest means to secure Sir JOHN's assistance in the granting of the amnesty, and it was on that ground, and on that ground only, that I promised, as I did then promise Sir JOHN, that I would endeavor to persuade RIEL to leave Red River for a while. I made to Sir JOHN the same observation which I had already made to Sir GEORGE, about the necessity of giving some money to RIEL if he were asked to leave the country. It was agreed by Sir JOHN that they would do something about that matter. That he would consult with Sir GEORGE and give me an answer afterwards. I got an answer, dated 27th December, 1871, from Sir JOHN, which I produce, under the direction of the Committee, as follows:

(No. 30.)

"(Private and strictly Confidential.)

"OTTAWA, December 27, 1871.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I have been able to make the arrangement for the individual that we have talked about.

"I now send you a sight draft on the Bank of Montreal for \$1,000. I need not press upon your Grace the importance of the money being paid to him periodically (say monthly or quarterly), and not in a lump, otherwise the money would be wasted, and our embar-

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

"rassment begin again. The payment should spread over a year.

"Believe me, Your Grace's

"Very obedient servant,

"Signed,) JOHN A. MACDONALD."

"His Grace

"The Archbishop of

"St. Boniface, Montreal."

He was sure the hon. gentleman would not expect him to pass over this branch of the subject without mentioning a little incident. About the same time that this letter was written, he (Mr. MACKENZIE) joined the Government of the hon. member for South Bruce in Ontario, and a short time after this letter was written, a resolution was passed in the Legislature of Ontario, offering a reward of \$5,000 for the apprehension of these men. This was in January or February, 1872, and the letter of the MINISTER OF JUSTICE, sending the \$1,000, was dated December, 1871, and in August, 1872, we found the right hon. gentleman proclaiming over the country that we had driven these men out of the country by the offer of the reward, and consequently he was unable to catch them. No doubt—in fact, he must believe it—the right hon. gentleman had forgotten that he had sent \$1,000 to induce RIEL to leave the country. Archbishop TACHE further stated in his evidence:—

"I left Montreal on the 2nd January, and at a station between Prescott and Sarnia, I received a letter from Sir GEORGE, which I have not with me, and I do not know whether it is in existence. In this Sir GEORGE alluded to the draft which had been sent me by Sir JOHN, and stated that it would be advisable that LEFINE should leave also, and that the money should be divided between the two."

Further on he stated:—

"It was then that I saw Lieutenant-Governor ARCHIBALD on the subject of money. There were conversations between the LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR of Manitoba and myself on the subject. The LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR called on Mr. SMITH, and, in my presence, asked if he could furnish the funds, which, of course, he said would be re-imbursed by the Canadian Government. I named at first £800 sterling to the GOVERNOR as the sum required by RIEL and LEFINE for themselves and their families. The GOVERNOR asked Mr. SMITH to lend £800 sterling. I mentioned that I had \$1,000 at my disposal, without mentioning the source, and thus the sum to be furnished by Mr. SMITH was reduced to £600 sterling. I understood that the advance was asked of and made by Mr. SMITH in his capacity of agent for the Company who were the bankers for the Territory. Mr.

SMITH said he could, and did, in fact, furnish £600 sterling. It was handed to me, and I added to the amount, out of the \$1,000 before mentioned, a little over \$200, to make up \$1,600 a piece for RIEL and LEFNE, which I gave them in accordance with their demand, to enable them to go and live outside the Territory. The remainder of the \$1,000 I kept in the bank of the Company to be used as required for the support of their families, and it was so used. I wrote the letter which they had asked of me, and I produce a copy, dated 16th February, 1872. * * * I am certain that the LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR and the Ottawa Government would repay the money. That money was furnished under the directions of Governor ARCHIBALD."

Now, he did not intend to make any comments at all upon that transaction, further than was pertinent to the subject in hand; but he had merely to say that it was an element in the consideration of this case when they found the MINISTER OF JUSTICE who was responsible for the administration of Justice, who was also the head of the Government, deliberately entering into an arrangement with his own ambassador to furnish funds to enable these parties to leave the territory. It would be exceedingly difficult, after that transaction—as a very eloquent Canadian writer wrote not long ago—to bring the men to trial without placing the MINISTER OF JUSTICE in the dock along with them. He now came to consider another question,—another part of the question rather—which, to his mind was even of more weight in considering what the House should do in this case than the events he had mentioned. That was the conduct of several parties in the North-West—the GOVERNOR and the Government—in connection with the Fenian raid in the Province. He would leave it to legal gentlemen in this House to say what was to be said of promises made by the Chief Magistrate of a country, under such circumstances. It was held, he knew, as a principle in ordinary constitutional law, that where a Government accepts the services of parties, and induces them to risk their lives, that that would undoubtedly act as a condonation of the offences of all such persons, if implicated in a movement of this character. That he merely mentioned the consideration of legal gentlemen; but he did say, whether this was really the law or not, whether it was to be understood as the law of nations, or not; as a law of Great Britain, or not; as a matter that binds the Crown or does not bind the

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

Crown technically, there could be no question, as Lord CARNARVON remarked, that it would be impossible to consider the sentences of these men, with a view to commutation, without considering the circumstances brought to light in connection with them; and whether the Imperial Government should deem these circumstances as of sufficient weight or not, this House, he had no hesitation in saying, and this Government, should consider, how far they should palliate the circumstances which the Courts of Justice had now recognized and characterized. Mr. GIRARD's evidence on this point was as follows:—

"I recollect the Fenian raid. I was then in the Government. I remember the arrival near the fort of the body of Metis numbering perhaps 400 or 500, perhaps one-third mounted and the rest dismounted. The greater part were armed. RIEL, LEFNE and PARENTEAU appeared to be jointly in command of them. Those three seemed to be on an equal footing.

"I informed the Lieutenant-Governor of their arrival, at the request of Mr. ROYAL, then Speaker of the Assembly.

"I told him that the Metis wanted to meet him either in the fort or on the other side of the river. I told him that RIEL and his friends were there. He consulted me whether it would be better to meet them in the fort or on the river. I recommended him to see them at the river. He agreed. We crossed the river; I in a rowboat; the Governor in a scow on horseback, accompanied by Captain MACDONALD I think. We came close to them, and I then said to the Governor that these men were ready to go to the front to defend their country; thereupon the Governor spoke to them saying, that he received their offer and had much satisfaction in meeting them.

"Afterwards there was a sort of salute fired and cheering on both sides of the river.

"Afterwards he went with me among the crowd at the river and I, ROYAL and DUBUC, introduced him to the prominent men, amongst whom was RIEL. I introduced RIEL as the man whom the half-breeds had chosen as their chief for the occasion. I thought it would be better not to give the name of RIEL to the Governor. This had occurred to my own mind on the way across the river. It had not in any way been discussed.

"I supposed he understood it was RIEL.

"Governor ARCHIBALD shook hands with RIEL when introduced to him in the way I have described.

"Mr. DUBUC introduced AMBROISE LEFNE by his name as a prominent man and the Governor also shook hands with him.

"PARENTEAU was also introduced by name, and the Governor shook hands with him.

"RIEL was the first introduced.

"After the introductions, RIEL addressed the Governor publicly saying that he was there with his friends to offer their service in defence of the country against all enemies, and asking the Governor to accept their services.

"The Governor thanked him very warmly for that offer of service, and told him it was received with much pleasure.

He did not know that it was necessary to read very much more upon this particular point. The fact was established by the evidence that he had read, that the Governor accepted the services of these parties and thanked them for turning out, but it did not develop the fact that the Governor apprehended serious danger unless he felt himself able to rely upon the assistance that the Metis could give him. Father RICHOT's evidence, on page 89, has this:

I wrote a letter to the Lieutenant-Governor upon the occasion of the O'Donohue Fenian raid. I have a copy of the letter which I can produce. The Lieutenant-Governor then wrote me a note stating that he desired to see me. I have not the letter of Mr. Archibald in which he asks to see me. I went to see him. This was on the 4th October, 1871. HIS EXCELLENCY said he wanted to know what attitude the French population would take on the occasion of the Fenian invasion. HIS EXCELLENCY stated that he was quite persuaded from what he had seen that the French population was loyal, but that under the circumstances such as those which presented themselves, it was his duty to have exact information of what was going on in the Province. He said if the population showed itself loyal, there would be nothing to fear from the Fenians, whatever might be their numbers; but if, on the contrary, part of the population was hostile to the authorities, the country would be lost, because when divisions took place in a camp nothing could be done. He said if they could trust to that part of the Metis or half-breeds near the frontier, they had nothing to fear; consequently, he wanted to know from me if I was in a position, living amongst the French half-breeds as I did, to tell him positively if he could count on them, and that I answered him that it was quite certain that he could count on them, and that I had seen the leaders of them, amongst whom was RIEL, and that they themselves were anxious to know what attitude the authorities would take on the occasion of the invasion by the Fenians. I also said that they only waited for word to go to the front if required, and to place themselves in a position to meet that invasion whatever it might be. I stated that in RIEL's opinion it was a measure of precaution which should be taken immediately. HIS EXCELLENCY commissioned me to tell the French Canadian half-breeds, and especially RIEL, that he would be very happy to see them giving their help to the authorities. I then observed to HIS EXCELLENCY that he (RIEL) was very perplexed because his friends told him that if he went forward and showed himself he would expose himself to be killed, that any action he would take would be badly interpreted, and that there were warrants out against him, and that he could be arrested the very moment he was in arms or elsewhere, if he

Hon. Mr. Madden.

appeared in a public assembly. HIS EXCELLENCY said there was no danger at all, and that any steps in that direction would be well considered, and that it was a good time for RIEL to prove his loyalty. HIS EXCELLENCY also said that it would be a further occasion for the hastening of the granting of an amnesty, and that it was the time to prove that what had been said against him was false. I promised to communicate what he had said to RIEL, and that on the very next day he would have news of my mission. Then after that I met friends, who observed to me that RIEL's friends would not allow him to go forward unless there would be something in writing, saying that RIEL would not be ill-treated. Upon this I took the liberty of writing the following letter to Mr. ARCHIBALD.

Then follows the letter and assurance given by the Governor that the actual circumstances would be considered and no harm would come to them. And then the two principal men address the following letter to HIS EXCELLENCY:

"ST. VITAL, 7th October, 1871.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—We have the honor of informing you that we highly appreciate what YOUR EXCELLENCY has been pleased to communicate to the Reverend Father RICHOT, in order that we might be better able to assist the people, in the exceptional position they have been placed in, to answer your appeal. As several trustworthy persons have been requested to inform you, the answer of the Metis has been that of faithful subjects. Several companies have already been organized, and others are in process of formation.

"YOUR EXCELLENCY may rest assured that, without being enthusiastic, we have been devoted.

"So long as our services continue to be required, you may rely on us.

"We have the honor,

"&c., &c., &c.,

"(Signed,)

"LOUIS RIEL,

"A. D. LEPINE,

his

"PIERRE X PARENTEAU.

"To the Hon.

Mark.

"Adams G. Archibald,

"Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba."

Now, it was quite possible that Governor ARCHIBALD might have exaggerated the danger of the occasion. He might have been wrong in assuming that the Province would be over-run by the Fenians unless he obtained the support of those men and their associates, but whether he was so or not, he was there as the representative of this Government, and as such, it was his duty to take measures to keep the peace. He chose to ignore all that had passed and invited their assistance to repel the threatened invasion, and that circumstance must

be taken into consideration when Parliament were about to determine the amount of punishment to be given to them for the offences they committed. He would not read Governor ARCHIBALD'S evidence, but would simply content himself with paraphrasing it. Governor ARCHIBALD stated in his evidence that he did apprehend serious danger, that the services of these men were tendered, that as the representative of HER MAJESTY he had accepted their services *pro tem.*, and these men entered into the service expecting to reap the reward usually given to men under such circumstances, and placed in such a position. There was one point that he (Mr. MACKENZIE) neglected to notice in connection with the promised amnesty. They found repeated evidence in Mr. LANGEVIN'S deposition, as well as in the deposition of the Archbishop, that Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD intended to go to England immediately after the session, and that he expected then to be able to settle the question of amnesty, and very much reliance appeared to have been placed upon this by the several parties interested. Now, he had only a very few words to say on another point. It was tolerably evident that when frequent communications take place, with people charged with such crimes, by the members of the Government, even if they were not of so serious an import as those referred to, such communications must have their weight. It would be remembered that among the disasters of the Conservative party in the general elections of 1872, the late Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER was defeated in Montreal. It would also be remembered that two candidates were before the electors of Provencher, in Manitoba—Attorney-General CLARKE and LOUIS RIEL—and we find that a series of communications passed between the members of the Administration here, including the PREMIER and Governor ARCHIBALD, in reference to the withdrawal of these two candidates, in order that Sir GEORGE CARTIER might take the seat. Archbishop TACHE in his evidence stated:—

"When we heard in Manitoba that Sir George had been defeated, I received a letter from Lieut. Governor Archibald either the 3rd or 4th September, 1872, which I produce:

Thursday morning, 5th September, 1872.

My Dear Archbishop,—Now or never. Do
Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

not let the chance, which will never recur, be lost. Could you see me to-day.

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed,) A. G. ARCHIBALD.

"His Grace the Archbishop."

"On the same day I went to him who explained to me that it seemed to him that it would be highly advisable that Riel (who was then a candidate for Provencher) should retire and allow Sir George to be elected. I said I would try and see Riel and ascertain his views. The Governor said that this would bind Sir George so tightly that he could not help doing even more afterwards than he had done towards the amnesty. I saw Riel and advised him to retire, giving him the same reasons, and also other reasons on behalf of his country. He told me that personally he would have no hesitation, that he understood perfectly well that it would be for the advantage of Manitoba to have a representative in the Cabinet, but that he was not quite sure his friends would view the matter in the same light, and that in order to satisfy them he must have some guarantee that the half-breeds would not be overlooked. He gave me, in writing, his conditions of withdrawal in favor of Sir George. I returned to Mr. Archibald, and stated the conditions, and myself wrote at his desk a translation made by himself, and which he was to have telegraphed to Sir George."

Then Lieutenant-Governor ARCHIBALD wrote to the Archbishop on the 10th of September, five days afterwards:

"They should elect Sir GEORGE by acclamation, without stipulations or conditions.

"It would be the graceful way, and would bind Sir GEORGE quite as effectually as any stipulations, which after all are not the making, but the renewal of pledges already given.

"However, this is not my business.

"Yours very sincerely,

(Signed,) A. G. ARCHIBALD.

"His Grace

"The Right-Rev. the Archbishop."

The next day Archbishop TACHE wrote to the GOVERNOR to ascertain whether RIEL'S conditions had been accepted or not. Then in reply to that, the GOVERNOR writes to Archbishop TACHE:—

"12th September, 1872.

"MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I received last evening a telegram from Sir JOHN, to say that he had received my message, and sent it to Sir GEORGE, and that he expected a reply to-day, and would forward it to me at once. I see that he thinks the constituency ought to elect Sir GEORGE promptly, and without stipulation. They could safely confide in promises which, being already made, can gain no strength by repetition. You shall have the answer of Sir GEORGE whenever it arrives.

"Yours sincerely,

(Signed,) A. G. ARCHIBALD.

"To His Grace the Archbishop."

The ARCHBISHOP continues:—

"The same evening I received from Mr. ARCHIBALD what he said was a copy of a telegram from Sir JOHN, as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 12th September, 1872.

"LIEUT. GOV. ARCHIBALD,—Sir GEORGE will do all he can to meet the wishes of the parties; this statement should be satisfactory.

"(Signed,) JOHN A. MACDONALD."

"Copy of telegram just received.

"(Signed,) HENRI BOUTHILLIER."

This was communicated to the parties; and just the night before the election I received the information that Riel had succeeded in inducing his friends to support the election of Sir GEORGE, and that on the following day he would, at the nomination, retire in his favour; and he did so, and immediately after sent Sir GEORGE a telegram, of which I produce a certified copy.

"WINNIPEG, 14th September, 1872.

"To Hon. Sir GEORGE ET. CARTIER,
Bart., Montreal.

"Your election in our County is by acclamation, and have reason to hope in the success of the cause trusted into your hands.

"(Signed,) "LOUIS RIEL,
"JOSEPH ROYAL,
"A. LEPINE,
"JAS. DUBUC."

I did not myself communicate with Sir GEORGE on the subject, but I received from him a telegram, dated 17th September, which I produce.

"OTTAWA, 17th September, 1872.

"To His Grace Archbishop TACHE.

"Presume your Grace is one of the friends who got me elected in Provencher; accept my sincere thanks. Give thanks for me to all friends, and especially to those who were more instrumental in securing election. Am leaving for England for brief visit for my health; will send letters of thanks before leaving.

"(Signed,) G. E. CARTIER."

He (Mr. MACKENZIE) had not the passage before him at the moment, but he thought the right hon. member for Kingston, with his usual foresight, wrote to Mr. ARCHIBALD to tell RIEL not to resign in Sir GEORGE's favor.

Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD—Tell RIEL!

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—Well, the late President of the Provisional Government.

Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, remembers my telegram very well. My telegram was to the Governor of Manitoba, and I asked him to get a seat for Sir GEORGE CARTIER in that Province, but

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

did not say to him to tell Riel not to retire in Sir GEORGE's favor.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—I did not misrepresent it.

Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD—Yes, but the hon. gentleman did!

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he did not mean to say that the words were actually employed that he stated, but the hon. gentleman suggested to the Governor not to state that RIEL resigned in Sir GEORGE's favor. He would proceed with the evidence given before the Committee, in order to obtain what was necessary to furnish the circumstances connected with the motion which he was placing in the SPEAKER's hands. He had merely to say that the Government having acted in this matter, bound as they were to put an end to this vexed controversy now and forever, their proposition was one which would commend itself to every reasonable man, and would answer the expectations of all those who did not take extreme views of the question on both sides. The Government had fairly prosecuted the enquiry regarding the North-West troubles. Those who viewed the offence of which these men stood accused as a crime were quite justified in every effort they made to bring the perpetrators to justice, and he could not condemn the efforts of those who saw in the death of SCOTT merely one of those executions which might occur, and did occur frequently, in insurrections of this nature. Many would recall to memory the incidents which occurred in the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada where lives were sacrificed just as cruelly and unjustly, perhaps, as the one now under discussion. He would not for one moment say a word to justify that execution. It was not only cruel, but entirely unnecessary. He had never been able to understand the reasons for it, but so far as he was able to understand them, they were from a proximate fear of troubles that SCOTT might cause, instead of punishment being inflicted for any crime committed. Some latitude should of course be given to the actors in the scene as being the existing authorities of the Province, and from the promises subsequently given, and the recognition of their services by the Crown, there was but one course to follow; for whether the Imperial authorities acknowledged Mr. ARCHIBALD as a British Governor or not,

regarding which point Earl CARNARVON had raised some question, we at least must recognise him as a Canadian Governor; and if the British Government were pleased to extend our responsibility, he for one was ready to accept it. At the present time it had become the duty of the Government—and he ventured to say it was also the duty of the House—to sustain the motion he had proposed as one that recognized at once that a crime had been committed, and tempered justice with mercy. This he said on the grounds afforded by the evidence before the House, which must have its due weight with all dispassionate and impartial men; and if they followed this course, he thought they would receive the cordial thanks of every member of this House for having removed what had been in time past a stain on the history of the country, and taking a step for which futurity would be thankful,—even if it were done at the risk of being more or less unpopular with one or more of the parties at the present time. He begged to move, in conclusion, the following motion of which he had given notice:

That from the evidence reported to this House by the Committee appointed last session on the questions arising out of the North-West troubles, it appears that the late Sir G. E. CARTIER, Minister of Militia and Defence, and during Sir J. A. MACDONALD'S illness, acting Minister of Justice, leader of the Government, and its representative in its negotiations with the delegates from the North-West, at various times, gave divers persons of prominence in the North-West, amongst whom were Archbishop TACHE, Father RITCHOT, the Hon. M. A. GIRARD and the Hon. J. ROYAL, assurances that a complete amnesty would be granted by the Imperial Government in respect of all acts committed by all persons during the North-West troubles, and requested that these assurances should be as they were communicated to the interested parties. That from the same evidence, it further appears that the envoy of the Canadian Government, Archbishop TACHE, acting in the *bona fide* belief that he was authorized to do so, assured the people of the North-West that the Imperial Government would grant such an amnesty; and the Canadian Government did not communicate to the people any disavowal of his action.

“That from the same evidence it further appears that the interested parties became, by means of the said assurances convinced that such an amnesty would be granted; and that this conviction so affected their action as to facilitate the acquisition of the territory by Canada.

“That from the same evidence it further appears, that, on the occasion of the raid of Fen-

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

ians, led by W. B. O'DONOHUE, one of the actors in the North-West troubles, the Hon. A. G. ARCHIBALD, Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, in the name of HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY, the Queen, by proclamation called on all the inhabitants to rally to its defence; and especially asked through Father RITCHOT, the aid of L. RIEL and A. D. LEFINE, and in reply to a letter from Father RITCHOT on the subject, wrote the following letter:

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE, Oct. 5th, 1871.

REVEREND SIR,—Your note has just reached me. You speak of difficulties which might impede any action of Mr. RIEL in coming forward to use his influence with his fellow citizens, to rally to the support of the Crown in the present emergency.

Should Mr. RIEL come forward as suggested, he need be under no apprehension that his liberty will be interfered with in any way; to use your own language, *pour la circonstance actuelle.*

It is hardly necessary for me to add that the co-operation of the French half-breeds and their leaders in the support of the Crown under present circumstances will be very welcome and cannot be looked upon otherwise than as entitling them to most favorable consideration.

Let me add that in giving you this assurance with promptitude I feel myself entitled to be met in the same spirit.

The sooner the French half-breeds assume the attitude in question the more graceful will be their action and the more favorable their influence.

I have the honor to be, Revd. Sir,
Yours truly,

(Signed) A. G. ARCHIBALD,
Lieutenant-Governor.

Revd. PERE RITCHOT,
St. Norbert.

And subsequently in reply to a letter to him from L. RIEL, A. D. LEFINE and P. PARANTEAU caused the following letter to be sent:—

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
“FORT GARRY, Oct. 8th, 1871.

“GENTLEMEN,—I have it in command from
“HIS EXCELLENCY the LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR
“to acknowledge receipt of your note of this
“morning, assuring HIS EXCELLENCY of the
“hearty response of the Metis to the appeal
“made to them in HIS EXCELLENCY'S proclama-
“tion.

“You may say to the people on whose behalf
“you write, that HIS EXCELLENCY is much
“gratified to receive the assurance which he
“anticipated in his communication with the
“Rev. PERE RITCHOT, and which your letter
“conveys, and that he will take the earliest
“opportunity to transmit to HIS EXCELLENCY
“the GOVERNOR-GENERAL this evidence of the
“loyalty and good faith of the Metis of Mani-
“toba.

“HIS EXCELLENCY will be pleased to be fur-
“nished as soon as possible with a nominal
“list of persons in each parish who desire to
“enrol for active service in the present emer-
“gency.

"His EXCELLENCY will rely upon their readiness to come forward the moment they receive notice.

"I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,

"W. F. BUCHANAN,
Acting Private Secretary.

"To M. L. RIEL,
"M. A. D. LEPINE,
"M. PIERRE PARANTEAU."

"That from the same evidence it further appears that the said L. RIEL, A. D. LEPINE and P. PARANTEAU accordingly raised a large body of men to assist in the defence of the Province and marched them to the vicinity of Fort Garry, where they were received and their services accepted by the Lieutenant-Governor, who shook hands with L. RIEL and A. D. LEPINE as leaders of the force, and by a subsequent proclamation recognized their services; and the action of the Lieutenant-Governor was not disavowed by the Canadian Government which continued him in his place and thereafter promoted him to the Lieutenant-Governorship of Nova Scotia."

"That from the same evidence it further appears that Sir J. A. MACDONALD, the first Minister of Canada and Minister of Justice, in Dec. 1871, after the Fenian Raid was over entered into negotiations through Archbishop TACHÉ, with the said L. RIEL for his retirement from the Province of Manitoba for the space of a year, and for his maintenance during this expatriation out of the public funds of Canada, and in order to induce him so to retire, pointed out to the Archbishop that the proposed step would improve the chances of obtaining the amnesty from HER MAJESTY'S Government, and stated that he would exert his personal influence to procure action in the matter by HER MAJESTY'S Government, and that he would so far make RIEL'S case his own and, having so induced the Archbishop to interfere, sent him the promised sum which was taken from the Secret Service Fund placed at the disposal of his Government by Parliament with the following letter:—

PRIVATE AND STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

OTTAWA, Dec. 27th, 1871.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP.—I have been able to make the arrangement for the individual that we have talked about. I now send you a sight draft on the Bank of Montreal for \$1,000. I need not press upon your Grace the importance of the money being paid to him periodically (say monthly or quarterly) and not in a lump, otherwise the money would be wasted and our embarrassments begin again. The payment should spread over a year.

"Believe me, your Grace's very obedient servant,
JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"His Grace,
"The Archbishop
"of St. Boniface, Manitoba."

That from the same evidence it further appears that Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER, Minister of Militia and Defence, afterwards communicated with Archbishop TACHÉ, requesting that

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

A. D. LEPINE should be included in the same arrangement, and that the Archbishop was, on his return to Manitoba, further requested by Lieutenant-Governor ARCHIBALD to procure the expatriation of the said persons, and in order to make a sufficient provision for the maintenance of themselves and their families the Lieutenant-Governor procured from the Hudson Bay Company the further sum of \$600, and that the Archbishop thereupon induced L. RIEL and A. D. LEPINE to consent to the requests of Sir J. A. MACDONALD, Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER and A. G. ARCHIBALD, and they departed accordingly, and they and their families received for their maintenance said sums of \$1,000 and \$600.

That thereafter and during the General Election of 1872 L. RIEL was contesting Provencher with Attorney-General CLARK, when, at the request of Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, First Minister and Minister of Justice, Lieutenant-Governor ARCHIBALD arranged that both the said candidates should retire in order that Sir G. E. CARTIER, Minister of Militia, might be elected for the County, and he was elected accordingly, and publicly received, and acknowledged the congratulations of L. RIEL and A. D. LEPINE on the event.

That from the said evidence it further appears that Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, First Minister and Minister of Justice, gave assurances to Archbishop TACHÉ, to his Quebec colleagues and others that he would on his intended visit to England press on HER MAJESTY'S Government to take up the question, thinking that they might see their way to granting a complete amnesty without the Canadian Government being responsible for it, to which he had no objection, and which would, he believed, be loyally accepted by the Canadian people.

That in the opinion of this House it is not for the honor or interest of Canada that the question of amnesty should remain longer in its present shape.

That in the opinion of this House the facts developed in the said evidence cannot be ignored by the people or the Parliament of Canada, and must be considered in the expression of their views as to the disposition of the question.

That in the opinion of this House it would be proper, considering the said facts, that a full amnesty should be granted to all persons concerned in the North-West troubles for all acts committed by them during the said troubles, saving only L. RIEL, A. D. LEPINE and W. B. O'DONOHUE.

That in the opinion of this House it would be proper, considering the said facts, that a like amnesty should be granted to L. RIEL and A. D. LEPINE, conditional on five years' banishment from Her MAJESTY'S Dominions.

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency, the GOVERNOR GENERAL, embodying this resolution and praying that he will be pleased to take such steps as may be best calculated to calculated to carry it into effect."

It being six o'clock, the House took recess.

—:++:—