

refer to a remark which had fallen from the hon. member for Lisgar. The history of the Hudson's Bay Company for the last ten years showed that it had not the force to put down the insurrection, as had been stated. He charged the member for Lisgar with being himself a fugitive from justice. (*Laughter.*) The hon. member for Lisgar had broken gaol when he was confined to await his trial on a charge of perjury, and that crime had not to this day been condoned either by amnesty or anything else.

He denied there was any evidence that Riel had been connected with the Fenian raid, except that an affidavit of a henchmen of the member for Lisgar—a man of such a character that he (Mr. Cunningham) had once kicked him out of his office when he knew that he came there to perjure himself in connection with this very case.

It had been said that Riel should go to Manitoba to be tried; but he (Mr. Cunningham) would advise him to go to any other Province to be tried rather than Manitoba, and he thought that he would have a good ground for giving this advice in the evidence of Attorney General Clarke before the House. Louis Riel had very good reason to be a fugitive from justice, considering the kind of a man who was his prosecutor; and he quoted the published report of the proceedings before the Court of Queen's Bench at Winnipeg in the case of the Queen v. Lépine and others, in proof of the extraordinary manner in which that officer did his duty.

He held that Louis Riel's crime was a political one, and he contended that the reception of the Northwest delegates by the Government of Canada, with no other credential than a letter from the Secretary of the Provisional Government, was a practical recognition of that Government. He agreed that the question of amnesty was one for the British Government to deal with. He called attention to the unfairness of rewarding the various members of that Council with situations, and hounding down a young man like Louis Riel, who had in all probability had less to do with the death of Scott than any other member of his Council.

In conclusion, he called upon hon. members to wait, as the amendment of the hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) wanted them to do until the Committee now sitting had finished their labours, before they voted to expel Louis Riel from the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE, who on rising was received with cheers, said he had not the slightest objection to the course that had been pursued by several hon. members in regard to himself in the matter. He thought it necessary that he should say a few words regarding his own line of conduct in the past. He had not the slightest object to the hon. member for Hastings North (Mr. Bowell), the hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Wellington Centre (Mr. Orton), adverting to his utterances upon this question in times past.

It was not without consideration, it was not at the heat of the moment, it was not until a considerable time had elapsed after the transaction concurred which gave rise to this debate that he had spoken to any portion of his fellow-countrymen upon it. It was not until the report of the hon. member for Selkirk—a report of which

the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Rochester) seemed to be ignorant, although it was the only authentic information on the subject they had got—was before the country that he had expressed any opinion upon the matter. He felt, under the circumstances detailed in that report, which had appeared in other quarters less authentically—and he was glad to know that hon. gentlemen coincided in his feelings—he did feel that no matter what allowances were to be made, and he never disguised his view that great allowances were to be made, for the inhabitants of the Northwest under the circumstances which attended the attempted transference of the Territory, the death of Scott would not be considered a political crime. (*Hear, hear.*)

He did not set up his judgment as infallible; but, as having founded it on the report of the hon. member for Selkirk, written upon the spot, at the time, as to the circumstances which surrounded the transaction, he was unable then, he had been unable since, and he was unable now to consider the matter but as something very different from a political transaction. He had called it before, and called it now, a murder, and not an execution. (*Cheers.*) So believing, he considered it his duty to bring before his fellow members of the Province of Ontario the circumstances under which that deed was done, so that perhaps some steps should be taken to indicate the course of outraged and insulted justice. (*Cheers.*)

There was a jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario at that period, combined, at any rate, with the Province of Quebec, and it was the opinion of the leading authorities in England that there still existed a jurisdiction in that Province to deal with offenses of that kind. Attempts had been made to assert that he had used inflammatory language with reference to the case. He said at the time that he would decline to describe in his own words, and he brought down the account of his hon. friend from Selkirk, which had been already quoted. He read that hon. gentleman's account, written upon the spot, and it was upon that statement that he asked his fellow countrymen to act. The hon. gentleman from Hastings North (Mr. Bowell), with an object which was extremely palpable, went on to say that at various times through the Province of Ontario he (Hon. Mr. Blake) used this topic as a means of inflaming the passions of the people.

He would now tell the House that an attempt had been made by the friends of the hon. gentleman belonging to the institution to which reference had been made on this occasion, to asperse the motives with which he (Hon. Mr. Blake) had been animated in the discharge of what he considered his turn; and he had resolved that at no public meeting in this country would he say a single word upon the subject of the Scott murder, unless called upon to do so by questions put, arguments used, and attacks made upon himself.

He believed he could count upon the fingers of one hand—he knew he could count upon the fingers of two—every allusion he made to it outside of the halls of the Legislature from the time it occurred until tonight. The very occasion to which the hon. gentleman referred was after a motion had been made in amendment to the amendment for which he voted on the subject of the Delorme investigation. The hon. gentleman would remember