

murderer. The hon. gentleman was one of those who squelched the offer of reward when it was first suggested. He adverted to the fact that the very person whom the hon. member for Simcoe called a murderer had since they last met resigned his chance of being elected to the Ottawa Parliament in favour of a noted Dominion politician.

Mr. WOOD said that when the intelligence of the murder of Scott reached Ottawa Dr. Tupper rose in his place in the House of Commons, and said he hoped there was some mistake. The Hon. J. H. Cameron also asked the Government if they had information on the subject, and stated that if it were true that a loyal Canadian subject, without provocation, had been savagely murdered he believed he could speak for the whole Province of Ontario that they were willing to shed their blood and spend millions in vindicating the honour of the British Crown and in vindicating justice. That declaration was re-echoed by every member of the House from Ontario. He would not pretend to follow the history of the lamentable, disgraceful, disastrous, imbecile Manitoba business, from the sending of the Hon. Wm. McDougall down to the present hour. In the following session of the Ontario Legislature, in the session of 1870-71, a resolution on the subject was proposed by Mr. Blake. He (Mr. Wood) proceeded to describe that resolution, and to defend the action of the late Government in reference to that resolution. At that time this House had no more jurisdiction over crime in Manitoba than over crime in any other country. He would pass from this part of the discussion with the observation that he thought the Government of J. Sandfield Macdonald acted in good faith, and from the standpoint of the highest expediency. He did not mean to say that this House had not a perfect right to offer a reward, and he conceived that under all the circumstances it was highly proper to offer a reward. They were told by a very high authority, the Premier of the Dominion, that this reward had a very singular effect upon the author of this murder. They were told by Sir John Macdonald that it made Riel run out of the country. Notwithstanding a Government had been organized in Manitoba, notwithstanding the perpetrator of this foul murder had been living in Manitoba with impunity, and had actually grasped the hand of the Lieut.-Governor, it had the effect of relieving the territory from the presence of a foul murderer for a season. At that time we were told by Sir John A. Macdonald that he lamented very much that Riel had gone to the United States and could not be caught. His language was, "Would to God we could catch him!" They found, however, a short time after that statement had been made, that Riel had returned and was taking part in the elections; at the same time the gentleman who so wished to catch him—(laughter)—was actively engaged in the election campaign. Was it not competent for that gentleman, by virtue of the position he held, to have written to the Lieutenant-Governor saying that it would be creditable to the British Crown and to justice, and in some measure meet the demands of justice, if he would suggest to his Attorney-General that he had better secure the apprehension and trial of Riel? (Hear, hear.) No such suggestion, however, emanated from Ottawa during the administration of the Hon. Mr. Archibald. He (Mr. Wood) intended to show where constitutionally and legally the whole matter rested. By the Imperial Act of 1803 provision was made for the administration of justice in matters of felony, &c., in what was called Rupert's Land and the North-West Territory. The Act provided that the Governor of Quebec should appoint persons to apprehend parties guilty of felonies, and transfer them to the Province of Quebec or Ontario, where they were to be tried. Certain parties were apprehended under that law, and some were sent to Little York and some to Quebec, where the latter were tried by the late Sir James Stewart. The reports of these trials were not numerous, but they were to be found in the Ottawa Parliamentary and other libraries. About 1821 this Act was further amended, and direct jurisdiction was given to the courts of Quebec and Ontario for crimes committed in the North-West Territory. Further enactments followed, to carry out the spirit of the Act of 1803. After the Union in 1841 the language of the Act of Parliament was retained. It vested in the Governor-General of Canada the powers formerly possessed by the Lieut.-Governors of the two Provinces. Upon the confederation of the Provinces in 1867 the powers before possessed by the Governor-General of Canada were vested in the Governor-General of the Dominion. He (Mr. Wood) asked with whom, when it was known this crime had been committed in

February, 1870, whilst that part of the country was known as Rupert's Land and the North-West Territory, the punishment of the crime rested.

Mr. LAUDER—With England.

Mr. WOOD said the hon. gentleman should be ashamed of himself to make that observation. It was with the Governor-General of the Dominion. (Hear, hear.) The British North America Act declared that power was vested in the Governor-General of the Dominion and his counsel. Until Manitoba was made a Province, and the criminal law extended to that Province, the power to punish the crime rested with the Government at Ottawa. (Hear, hear.) But upon the establishment of tribunals in Manitoba, and the appointment of a Lieut.-Governor and judges, the jurisdiction over this crime passed to the tribunals of Manitoba, and there it was at that moment. He would ask the House and the country who was responsible that no officers were sent to Fort Garry who had sufficient moral courage to put into execution the laws of the land. In referring to the backwardness of the Lieut.-Governor and Attorney-General of Manitoba in the matter, he alluded to the circumstance of Riel subsequently attempting to assassinate another subject within a few miles of Fort Garry, and observed that it might be said that the authorities would not move in the matter. Why was not some one sent there who would move in it and vindicate the honour and justice of England? The hon. gentleman proceeded to describe the hasty trial and subsequent cold-blooded execution of Scott. He would not say that Riel should be hanged, but he maintained that he ought to be brought before a British court, and take his trial, and suffer the consequences of the great crime he had committed. He (Mr. Wood) was not responsible for the subject being brought before the House, which, he thought, understood his views upon the question. He was prepared to say that a grosser compromise, a grosser instance of compromising a felony, never occurred than the compromising of the foul murder under discussion, under such circumstances. It reflected disgrace on the whole people, on the whole nation. He afterwards referred to the action taken in the matter by the Dominion Government, and explained the reason of the absence of the Hon. Mr. Blake upon the division taking place on the motion for an investigation into the charges against Mr. Delorme. He alluded to these matters particularly to show that every member of the Government, down to the whippers-in, formed one solid phalanx in voting down these resolutions. Sir John had said at Peterborough that he only wished he could catch Riel, but there had been abundant opportunities to catch him since then. Nay, this Riel had been a candidate in Manitoba for Parliamentary honours, and had graciously made way for Sir George Cartier. (Hear, hear.) If the gentleman who had brought forward the present resolution thought he had elevated his party by doing so he was welcome; but if not, either let him take what he had got to-night as a blessing or hereafter hold his peace. (Great applause.)

Mr. ROBINSON was glad that the matter was brought up, because he hoped it would be continually brought up until a change was made in the Government at Ottawa, which was responsible for the long freedom of the murderers of Thomas Scott. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who now brought the matter before the House did so to cover his many bad actions in reference to it. The motion of Mr. Blake in 1871 had been voted down by the aid of the member for S. Simcoe, on account of a telegram from Sir John Macdonald, who wished the motion squelched at any cost. He believed it a piece of hypocrisy on the part of the hon. gentleman to bring this question before the public again. The Government at Ottawa were afraid of bringing Riel to justice because they dreaded that he would disclose some of their own bad actions. He was rejoiced to see that, out of the forty who had voted against Mr. Blake's resolution, only about twenty had returned to the House to tell the tale.

Mr. CAMERON did not think that, in the present state of the public business, much time had been lost by the present discussion, although a good deal of gas had been emitted. In 1871 the Administration of John Sandfield Macdonald declared that in their view the question of the arrest of the murderer of Thomas Scott was one not properly pertaining to this House, and that view was now borne out by the legal opinion expressed by the learned counsel employed by the Orange body. When the mover of the resolution introduced into this House in 1871 had been taking no action towards bringing the murderers of Scott to