be referred to the Committee of Public Accounts.

On motion of Mr. Gibson, leave of absence was accorded to Mr. Gibbons until Monday next.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie, seconded by Mr. Blake, returns were ordered by the House with respect to the late elections, showing the aggregate number of votes in each electoral district, &c., &c.

THE SCOTT MURDER.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving a resolution on this subject, said it was necessary he should refer to the debates of a former session; and he was not at all ashamed to repeat what he had then said in bringing forward a similar motion. An attempt had been made to look upon this matter as a religious question, but he denied that as far as he was concerned there was any foundation for that statement. He felt bound to re-affirm what had been stated by several of his hon. friends, that all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in this Province felt an equal interest in the administration of British law in favor of British subjects and an equal degree of indignation at the crime which the resolution referred to, and an equal desire to carry out that resolution. He believed that was the true sentiment of the people of Ontario, that it was an outrage which ought to be punished, and that it was committed under circumstances which rendered it proper that it should be brought under the notice of that chamber. It should be remembered that the murdered man was not only a British subject but a citizen of Ontario. That Province had taken a deep interest in the settlement of Manitoba and had looked upon it as furnishing the means of sustaining emigrants from this Province. They (the Ministry) had strongly held by that view; they desired, as every patriotic Canadian must desire, an accession to their territory, that those who emigrated from them might be able to go where they could still remain British subjects and, still more, Canadians. This Province, therefore, felt deeply interested in the administration of British justice in that portion of her Majesty's dominions. At the time the outrage was committed two persons were arrested, and the opinion of the judges was taken that they had jurisdiction in the matter, and that the murderers, if found there, could be tried, convicted and executed. It was said that, by discussing this question, they were interfering with another government, but he maintained that the House was entitled to discuss and to take action with reference to matters beyond its legislative functions. For instance, they were not able to legislate for Nova Scotia or Quebec, yet that did not prevent them from discussing their affairs, and sending them large sums of money for those in distress. He therefore maintained that in a matter affecting the life of a citizen of this Province, it was proper for the House to take notice of it. The resolution which he moved last year had been met by a resolution which led the House to believe that a diligent effort was being made to arrest the murderers, and to express satisfaction at warrants being issued; but he (Mr. Blake) did not believe that they had ever been issued, or if issued that they were intended to be served. Under the circumstances he thought the House would not be prepared to stultify itself again in the same manner. The House then expressed its regret, and expressed its joy, but declared itself to have no jurisdiction in the matter. He then read his resolution, "That this House feels bound to express its regret that no effectual steps have been taken to bring to justice the murderers of Thomas Scott, and its opinion that something should be done to that end."

Mr. ROBINSON wished to make a few remarks. The murder of Scott was one of the most foul and dastardly ever committed, and there was a strong feeling about it in the country. Those who voted against this resolution would find the effects of it at the next election.

Hon. E. B. WOOD thought it was unjust to the last Parliament to imply that the strongest opinion had not prevailed in that House with respect to that cold-blooded murder. The spirit of the resolution was that the House expressed its regret at the crime and the hope it would be punished. He had no doubt, and never had any, that the jurisdiction in this matter lay with the Dominion authorities. Even the judicial courts of Manitoba, not having an *ex post facto* authority, had no jurisdiction. So that here they had a British subject murdered and yet no cognisance could be taken of it. It was an everlasting disgrace and a blot on Britain's fair fame if that murderer could thus bid defiance to justice. He had the Acts before him vesting authority in the Canadian authorities going back to the year 1803. As late as 1859 those laws had remained in force. What became of that jurisdiction under the Confederation? If it belonged to the Province how was it that the crime had been permitted to go unpunished for two years. The reason was that the highest law officers of the Crown had given their opinion to the contrary. Then if the jurisdiction rested with the Governor-General, why had not the proper steps been taken. The people of this country were determined that justice should be done. (Cheers). He (Mr. Wood) regretted that the resolution did not go farther; he would be prepared to support the Government in offering a large reward for the apprehension of the murderer. No feeling of partyism or religious differences should be permitted to be taken into consideration. He should support the resolution.

Mr. MONK said that the murderer should be brought to justice as having murdered a citizen of Ontario, apart from any question about his being an Orangeman. He would disdain any Government which would not take steps to bring the murderer to justice.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that the late Government had been hardly dealt with in this matter, but his opinion remained the same. The resolution now proposed could have no effect against Riel; that House was not the place to deal with the matter. The hon. gentleman had appeared in another legislature since that resolution was moved, but he did not appear then to approve of any reward being offered. That resolution was brought forward to obtain popularity in the country. There had been a rebellion in Canada in which he (Mr. Cameron) with other members of his family had borne arms in defence of order, and it was not against him that a charge of disloyalty should be made at this time, because he did not approve of a resolution which was in fact a mere prostitution of the Assembly. If that resolution could do any good he would support it, but it was only intended to gain a little popularity. The resolution was merely a repetition of the opinion which had been expressed many times over by the people outside the House. One of the hon. gentleman's colleagues had supported the resolution moved in opposition to the hon. gentleman's resolution to the effect that it was inexpedient to act.

Hon. Mr. WOOD held that the circumstances were now different.

Mr. CAMERON repeated that the present hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, though according to his late statement not at that time a cordial supporter of the late Government, had voted with them and against the hon. gentleman on that resolution. No end could be accomplished by discussing the matter there. If a reward was offered did they think it would have any effect At the time that matter was discussed the murderer was in a foreign country, and resolutions could produce no effect either then or now. He said, as he had always said, that no man less approved of rebellions than himself; but who were they, to judge the actions of a man in another country. He disapproved entirely of the conduct of Riel, and would be most willing to do all he could to bring him to justice; but that was a very different thing from that House as a Legislative Assembly expressing an opinion. His opinion had in no way changed, but the responsibility now lay with hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman had been at Ottawa since his first resolution but it did not appear that he had urged any immediate action. The hon. gentleman's only object was to fulfil the promise he had made to his constituency.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE asked when he had made such a statement. But he had made an explanation on the subject to the electors.

Mr. CAMERON said that on a late occasion the hon. gentleman had undertaken to take some action

Hon. Mr. McKENZIE—What then?

Mr. CAMERON continued—If the hon. Treasurer had been listening to his argument he would not have interrupted him. The hon. gentleman had given notice of that resolution in order to embarrass the late Government, and had now brought it forward to gain popularity.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE accused the hon. member for East Toronto of speaking in a style of official insolence, and in an offensive tone which should not go unpunished. Did the hon. gentleman think that that style of factious opposition would strengthen him in the position of leader of the Opposition? The hon. gentleman himself, however, displayed a more factious opposition than he (Mr. Mackenzie,) had ever seen before.

Mr. LAUDER rose to order. Was the hon. Treasurer to be permitted to indulge in that style of personality?

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had too much experience as a member of Parliament to lay himself open to a charge of being out of order. Mr. Mackenzie went on to refer to the circumstances under which the resolution was moved last year; his hon. friend's course had been consistent throughout, and it was now his intention to act in the manner he had then pointed out. Justice must be done in this matter, and if Ontario took the lead, the Dominion could not fail to do its duty. It was not fit to use the word high treason for it was simply a case of foul murder.

Mr. FAREWELL said there was every reason to believe that Scott's murder was attributable to the fact that he was a loyal British subject He (Mr. Farewell) was of opinion that there was no greater security anywhere for life and property than in Great Britain, and next to the Mother Country, he would claim the same security for Ontario. A few years ago they had seen the British nation arise in its might to rescue a few British subjects from the hands of King Theodore; the same spirit was imprinted in this country, and in his own part of the country he had heard wonder and astonishment expressed at the inaction of the Government. It had been said that jurisdiction in the matter nowhere existed.

Mr. WOOD said that he had maintained that the jurisdiction lay with the Dominion authorities.

Mr. FAREWELL was glad to hear that. He hoped the law would be set in motion, and if no law existed to deal with the matter, let laws be made. He agreed with the view of the hon. member for East Toronto that the matter now lay with the Administration, and he trusted that it would be not allowed to slip out of sight.

Mr. SEXTON referred to the circumstances of the Trent outrage as an example of the determination manifested by Great Britain of vindicating her own honor; and he asked whether that House was not prepared to act on that precedent, and to use every effort to bring the murderer to justice. The hon. member for East Toronto had referred to the rebellion, but he had better leave that alone; the memory of Mackenzie and the others would be remembered with approval when that of the hon. gentleman was forgotten.

Hon. E. B. WOOD hoped the House would allow him to make a remark. It had been asked why he did not take the iniative when at Ottawa; but the Government had then expressed itself so determined to deal with the matter that he could not interfere.

Mr. H. S. MACDONALD said that whether the late Administration was justified in acting as it had done or not, at all events an effort had been made in the Dominion Parliament to deal with it. He had believed that the warrant against Reil had been issued, but it had been since reported that the warrant had laid for a year in the hands of the officials at Manitoba. He thought the hon Premier was deserving credit for taking action [illegible] he had done, and thought the House would be a unit in supporting vigorous action. He trusted that the resolution would be carried unanimously and thereby show to ried unanimously and thereby show to those who had jurisdiction that the voice of the people must not be disregarded.

Mr. PERRY had been astonished to hear the remarks of the hon. member for East Toronto, and held that it was their privilege in that House to discuss any matter which came under their notice.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said it had been stated that he had opposed the measures of the present Premier, and also with reference to the resolution. He had, however, cordially agreed with the spirit of that resolution, and when called upon to join in drawing up a counter resolution he had refused to do so. But acting as he was then with a particular party, he felt that it was not his duty to break away from the leaders of that party to give effect to his own views, and therefore he had acted as he did He cordially supported this resolution.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS would support the resolution in the hope that it would lead to something tangible There was no difference of opinion in Ontario as to meting out of justice in this case.

Mr. DEACON said, if he had been in the last Parliament he should have supported the resolution of the hon. member for South Bruce, and thought the late Government had made a fatal blunder in taking the course they did. He, for one, did not believe that any real attempt had ever been made to serve the warrant on Riel. He thought a strong representation should be made to the Dominion Government. As an Orangeman, he said that if Scott had been a Roman Catholic he should have felt just as strongly on the subject. It had not been asked what creed Cameron professed before the expedition was sent out to Abyssinia to release him at a cost of five millions sterling. He would support anything which would lead to bringing the murderer to justice.

Mr. DEROCHE expressed his hearty sympathy with the resolution of the hon. Premier. He thought there was no question which had excited so much attention in the country as the murder of Scott. He should vote for the resolution.

Mr. GIBSON would heartily support the motion. Two of his constituents had been at Fort Garry and witnessed the disgraceful scene of the Lieut.-Governor shaking hands with the murderer. If there had been any intention of serving the warrant, why was it not then done?

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said the hon. member for East Toronto had imputed motives to him, but he did not believe the House would believe that he was seeking to do good from an evil motive.

The motion was then put, and was received with the cry of "carried" from all parts of the House; however,

Mr. ROBINSON called for a division, and the names of members were taken as follows: ayes, 62; nays, 1.

AYES—Messrs. Barber, Baxter, Bethune, Blake, Boulter, Boultbee, Carling, Christie, Clarke, (Norfolk), Clarke, (Wellington) Clemens, Code, Cook, Corby, Craig, Crooks, Crosby, Dawson, Deacon, Deroche, Fairbairn, Farewell, Finlayson, Fitzsimmons, Galbraith, Gibbons, Gibson, Gifford, Gow, Graham, Grange, Guest, Hodgins, Lauder, McCall, McCallum, McCraig, Macdonald, (Cornwall) Macdonald, (Leeds) Mackenzie, McLeod, Merrick, Monk, Oliver, Pardee, Patterson, Perry, Prince, Read, Scott, (Ottawa) Sexton, Sinclair, Smith, Springer, Tooley, Webb, Williams, (Durham, Williams, (Hamilton) Wilson, Wood (Brant) —62.

NAYS—Cameron—1.

It being within a few minutes of six the House took the usual recess.

AFTER RECESS.

ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE had no doubt that the House would unanimously agree to the resolution which he was now about to move. Before the adjournment of the House for the holidays he had prepared an address of this nature, but in consequence of the intelligence then received he had not thought it then opportune to bring it before the House. Mr. Blake then referred to the recent serious illness of the Prince of Wales, and to the afflictions to which Her Majesty and the Royal Family had been exposed. He passed a high eulogium upon the conduct of Her Majesty, and remarked on the strong sympathy existing between the Queen and her subjects, that her joys and sorrows were the joys and sorrows of her subjects. There could be no doubt that at this period of England's history it was of the highest importance that there should be no long regency in England, and that His Royal Highness should be restored to health. Under these circumstances he would move, seconded by Mr. Cameron, that an address be presented to Her Majesty expressing their congratulations on the recovery of His Royal Highness.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON seconded the motion, remarking that it would be strange indeed here, where they claimed to be so deeply attached to British institutions if they were not deeply concerned in the afflictions of the Royal family. He knew of no portion of Her Majesty's dominions more loyal than this Province, and he trusted the time would never come when that feeling would be weakened. Under these circumstances he had much pleasure in seconding the motion.

The address was then read by the Clerk, and was ordered to be placed in the hands of His Excellency for transmission to the Governor General.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE it was agreed that on Friday next the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

IMPROVED LANDS.

The second reading of the Bill introduced by the hon. Premier for the protection of persons improving lands under a mistake of title.

Mr. BLAKE said that the principle involved in this Bill was one which had been adopted in several countries. It was eminently a preventive measure. The gross injustice which had arisen from defective titles had on several occasions caused acts to be obtained of a retroactive character. Mr. Blake explained

The Daily Telegraph

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, JAN. 24, '72.

Second Parliament—First Session.

TUESDAY, Jan. 23, 1872.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3.10.

PETITIONS.

The following were presented:—

By Mr. FAREWELL—From Wm. Holditch and others of Muskoka, for investigation into the conduct of a certain judicial officer in that district. Also, from John Dohert and others of Muskoka, for the appointment of judicial officers.

By Mr. DEROCHE—From John Albertson and others of Frontenac, for the destruction of a certain dam on Mud Lake.

By Mr. McCALL—From James Price and others of Norfolk, praying that no further land be granted to the Long Point Company.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, (Hamilton) —From Brooks W. Gossage and others for an Act to incorporate them as the Canada Petroleum Company. Also, from the City Council of Hamilton to enable them to close certain streets.

By Mr. PARDEE—From the County Council of Lambton for the construction of a Harbor of Refuge at Port Franks. Also, from the Township Council of Crowland, for certain amendments to the Registry Act.

By Mr. SINCLAIR—From the Baptist Missionary Convention, for an Act of Incorporation.

By Mr. COYNE—From John Cameron of Toronto, for amendments to the Act of Incorporation of the Pickering Harbour Road Company

By Dr. BOULTER—From James Willmott and others of Toronto, for amendments to the Dentistry Act.

By Mr. DEROCHE—From James Wood and others of Frontenac, for an Act to legalize the by-law of the County of Frontenac in favor of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

By Mr. HODGINS—From John Walterworth and others of Woodville, for the authorization of the building of a certain railway.

THE COMMITTEES.

The reports of the Standing Committees were then read and adopted.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CAMERON—Bill to incorporate the Toronto Life Assurance Company.

Mr. SEXTON—Bill to amend Joint Stock Coal Company's Act. To be read a second time on Monday next.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR—A Bill to render members of the House of Commons ineligible for election as members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Second reading ordered for Monday next.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE—Bill to provide for making appropriations from the Railway Aid Fund. Second reading on Tuesday next.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD thought the House was entitled to some explantion as to the mode in which the Government proposed to carry out the policy they had declared with regard to this fund.

Mr. BLAKE would let the House know about that in a very short space of time, and read the provisions of the bill.

On motion of Mr. Blake, leave was given to introduce a bill for further securing the independence of Parliament. Ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie, the public accounts of 1870 and 1871 were ordered to