

Witness produced the warrant, which was read by the Clerk. In the usual legal terms it commanded the Sheriff to bring before the Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench the body of Louis Riel, to answer for an indictment found against the said Louis Riel, for the murder of one Thomas Scott. It was signed "J.J. McKeagney, Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench", and dated Winnipeg, 15 November, 1873.

Q.: Have any steps been taken to secure the arrest of the said Louis Riel, member for Provencher? If so, state what was done.

A.: The Sheriff, police officers, and detectives of the Province have been in search of Louis Riel from the time of the issuing of the warrant to the present time, but he has evaded their pursuit.

The SPEAKER took exception to the reply as containing statements which Mr. Clarke could hardly be expected to know as facts within his own knowledge.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell) said the reply was quite regular.

Q.: Do you know whether a warrant for the arrest of Louis Riel has been put into the hands of the police officers in the City of Ottawa?

A.: I have no personal knowledge of the fact.

Q.: Do you know any facts as Attorney General of Manitoba relative to Riel's participation in the murder of Thomas Scott? If so state them.

Hon. Mr. SMITH (Westmorland) thought the question objectionable, as it was putting this man on his trial for murder, but this was not a Court to try him, and the question was entirely out of order.

The SPEAKER thought the question objectionable, as it implied that Riel's participation in this matter had been to some extent established.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell) said it was established that the party named in the warrant was a fugitive from justice, and he thought that was all it was necessary to get from this witness.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON denied that it was established that Mr. Riel was a fugitive from justice. He had been in this building and placed his name upon the roll of members; therefore, he was clearly not a fugitive from justice. In the case of Mr. Sadlier, the order was that he should appear in his place and answer for himself, and he had every reason to believe, if such an order were made in this case, Mr. Riel would appear and justify himself.

After further discussion,

The SPEAKER ruled the question out of order.

Mr. BOWELL put the following question: Do you remember the threatened Fenian invasion of the Province of Manitoba in the year 1871?

Mr. McDONNELL submitted that all the questions which had been put except those relating to the indictment were irregular, as the notice on the paper was confined to the subject of the

indictment. Mr. Riel was a member of this House, and if he had been properly notified of the examination which was to take place here today, he might have been in attendance. In the absence of an hon. member of this House, hon. gentlemen present were bound to protect his rights.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell) said that when the witness was at the bar they had a right to ask any question though the House might determine whether it should or should not be put.

Mr. McDONNELL asked if it was fair to Mr. Riel.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell) asked why Louis Riel was not in his place to defend himself. He was in this building yesterday, signed the roll, and was sworn in. If he were absent it was his own fault.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (Marquette) said if matters were to be entered into so fully, it would be well to ascertain whether there were not political or personal reasons for it.

Mr. PALMER thought that such an insinuation was needless, to say the least. What was to be proved was whether Louis Riel was a fugitive from justice or not. If he were, it was for the House then to say whether he should be expelled from Parliament. If Louis Riel was not present to defend himself he had no one to blame for his absence. Under the rules of the House he should be in his seat.

Mr. BOWELL explained that his object in asking the question was to prove that Louis Riel was not only a fugitive from justice, but also that he was concerned in the Scott murder. If he were not allowed to put the question, it would only necessitate the putting of another motion on the paper. He expected that every technical objection would be taken to frustrate a full investigation. (*Cries of "Order"*.) He regretted that a disposition had been shown to observe all the legal technicalities of a law court instead of prosecuting the investigation with a view to eliciting all the facts.

Hon. Mr. SMITH (Westmorland) did not regard the question as one of order as to the question of fact, but it should not go so far as to show that Riel had any complicity in that invasion. That, he considered, would be unjust.

Hon. Mr. DORION had no objection to the question, though precedent showed that the proceedings should commence by a notice to the member concerned to appear in his place.

After some further discussion,

The SPEAKER ruled the question out of order, on the ground that under the present order of the House they had nothing to do with the Fenian invasion.

Mr. BOWELL then proceeded with his examination of the witness.

Q.: Have any steps been taken by you to procure the outlawry of Louis Riel in consequence of his non-appearance at the Court of Queen's Bench to answer the indictment found against him?

Hon. Mr. SMITH (Westmorland) said that it seemed to him that was not a proper question. The answer to it must imply