

90. No Brother shall be eligible for election to the Office of County Master or County Deputy Master, until he shall have had conferred upon him the Royal Scarlet Degree.

91. The regular Annual Meeting of the County Lodge shall be held on the first Tuesday in February of each year. Should, however, no Lodge be held on that day, the Officers shall hold Office until their successors are elected and installed, which may be done at any subsequent Meeting, regular or special, of the Lodge, and it is hereby declared to be the duty of the Lodge, under such circumstances, at its next Meeting, regular or emergency, to elect Officers.

92. Nine members shall form a quorum, without which number being present no County Lodge can open or work.

93. It shall be the duty of the County Master or presiding Brother to appoint two Tylers, whose duties shall be the same as those of the Tylers for the M. W. the Grand Lodge of British America.

94. In the absence of the County Master, the Deputy Master shall preside; if both be absent, the next senior Officer present shall be Chairman, and his powers, *pro tem*, over and in the Lodge shall be those of the County Master.

95. If the Deputy Chair be vacant, the presiding Brother shall direct one of the Brethren present to take it.

96. It shall be the duty of the County Master to countersign all warrants issued during his term of office in his County. Should anything occur, however, to induce him to withhold his signature, he shall at once acquaint the Right Worshipful the Provincial Grand Master and the Brother to whom the warrant is directed.

97. Upon any complaint being made, by not less than five members of a Lodge, against a District Officer, or against the Master or Deputy Master of any Private Lodge, in their official capacity, it shall be the duty of the County Master to call a County Meeting within a reasonable time, not to exceed one month after such complaint shall have been made, and summons the party complained of to appear, and he shall, at the same time, notify the parties complaining to attend, in order to substantiate his or their complaint.

98. Should none of the complaining Brethren appear, without any reason given, then shall the Lodge acquit the Brother or Brethren complained of, and, at their discretion, fine the complaining Brethren not more than two dollars each; or should the charge turn out to be frivolous and vexatious, the Lodge may, in addition to the said fine, suspend all or any of the complaining Brethren.

THE BRITISH MEMBERS OF THE JOINT HIGH COMMISSION.

YANKEE OPINION OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper has an excellent picture of the British members of the Joint High Commission now sitting in Washington together with the following pen and ink sketch. Our Premier has won golden opinions from our Republican neighbors, and would seem from a perusal of the following, to be considered the ablest man among the British representatives:—

"The Joint High Commission has already held several sessions at the State Department, Washington, D. C., and although little has been made known of the proceedings, it is said that the English Commissioners are pleased with the prospects of a speedy and satisfactory termination of their labors.

"George Frederick Samuel Robinson, Earl de Grey and Ripon, was born in London in 1827, and succeeded his father as second Earl de Grey in 1859. He served as a member of the House of Commons for Huddersfield, subsequently for the West Riding of Yorkshire from 1853 to 1859, when he entered the House of Lords. He was formerly well known in the House of Commons by his courtesy title of Lord Goderich. While in the House of Commons he acted with the radical party. He was under-Secretary of War in June, 1859; Under-Secretary of State for India from January to August, 1861; Secretary of War from 1863 to 1866, and was appointed Lord President of the Council in December, 1863. The Earl is a man of decided talent, and Grand Master of the Masonic fraternity in England.

"Sir Edward Thornton is well known to the American public, having been British Minister to this country since the death of Sir Edward Bruce. He has had considerable diplomatic experience, having represented his country in Italy, Brazil, Mexico and several of the South American republics. Since his arrival here Sir Edward Thornton has displayed much energy and ability in his endeavours to bring our claims upon Great Britain to a satisfactory settlement. He was created a baronet a short time ago.

"Sir John A. Macdonald, K. C. B., is the present Premier of Canada, and is conceded to be the foremost statesman of the Dominion. He was born in 1815 studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1835. Entering into politics as a conservative, he was elected a member of the Colonial Parliament in 1844, and has ever since represented Kingston. Soon after entering Parliament he became a member of the then Ministry of Canada, and retired in 1859. In 1854 he re-entered the Cabinet as Attorney-General, resigned in 1862, having been Premier for a brief period, and became Attorney-General again in 1864. During the following year he was appointed Minister of Militia. He was one of the earliest advocates of the confederation of the colonies, and was one of the delegates from Canada who went to London in 1866 to arrange the terms.

"The Right Hon. Sir Stafford Henry Northcote was born in London, October 27th, 1813, and is consequently in his fifty-third year. He is a graduate of Balliol College, Oxford, in which he took a first class in classics and was admitted to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1847. In 1851 he acted as one of the secretaries to the Great Industrial Exhibition, and was made a C. B. in recognition of his services. He entered Parliament in 1855, when he was returned in the Conservative interest from Dudley. He represented the borough of Stamford from 1858 to 1866, when he was elected by the freeholders of Devonshire North, as their spokesman in the House of Commons. Sir Stafford was private secretary to Mr. Gladstone when the present Premier was President of the Board of Trade, whence he was transferred on the retirement of Earl Derby to the India Office, and became Secretary of State for India.

"Montague Bernard is a man of decided ability. He is professor of International Law at Oxford; and is known in connection with American questions as the author of a ponderous work on the neutrality of England during our civil war—a publication supposed to have been written at the instance of the late Lord Clarendon. The work takes the extreme English view of the case, and is a labored effort to prove that the United States have no just cause of complaint.

"With the exception of Sir John A. Macdonald, perhaps the ablest man in the English Commission is Lord Tenterden, the secretary. He has very recently come to his title, being better known as Mr. Abbott, of the Foreign Office. He is the author of the famous "Notes and Observations," presented by Lord Clarendon in answer to Mr. Fish's despatch of the 20th of September, 1869, upon the Alabama question. He is about forty-three years old.

"It will thus be seen that on the British Commission are two men who have made the Alabama and kindred questions their peculiar study, while upon the fishery and other Canadian questions the leading Canadian statesman is placed in charge."

A ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP ON THE CONFESSIOAL.—The *Liverpool Mercury* states that the Right Rev. Dr. Goss presided at the annual meeting of the Catholic Reformatory Association the other day, and made an extraordinary statement. Referring to the chaplain's report on the state of the boys, he said:—"Generally speaking, the chaplain's testimony was worthless, and he was the last person to whom he should apply for the character of any person. There had been an instance of a person who had stolen some fowls confessing the same to the priest, and afterwards obtaining a good character from him. The employer of the man afterwards went to the priest and said, 'He confessed to you that he had stolen some fowls, and yet you have given him a good character.' The answer of the priest was, 'I knew nothing of his stealing the fowls in my capacity of giving him a character.' This needs no comment. Murphy never uttered a more biting sarcasm on the system of the Confessional.

THE POPE'S HABITS.

The Roman "James" of a fashionable London contemporary furnishes some facts about the eating habits of the Pope. His Holiness's personal habits and requirements, he is assured, are simple, and do not cost 400 francs a month, a minimum expenditure of which no other European sovereign could boast. The Pope dines alone, and takes all his meals alone. His breakfast consists of a basin of tooth and bread, followed by a cup of coffee without milk. At two punctually the Pontiff's dinner is served; it consists invariably of soup, boiled meat or poultry, with vegetables, a dish of *fritto*, which means anything or everything that can be cooked in a frying-pan, and a *roste*, which equally means anything that can be put upon a spit. Of these three dishes His Holiness usually tastes but two, and it is a rare specimen of good appetite if he eats of all of them. But he is fond of fruit after the more solid part of the repast, and, provided there is a good dessert he requires no sweet dishes. The Pope's concluding repast is of the simplest character, consisting of soup, a boiled egg, and a pear. The Pope is no great wine drinker, differing in that respect very materially from his convivial predecessor, Gregory XVI, who was always reputed to be fond of his bottle.

MR. GLADSTONE AND THE POPE.

The *Advertiser* remarks that "Mr. Gladstone's mind has a Blondin-like power of travelling along a thin thread of logical sequence with an abyss of illogical folly on either side. Nowhere was this power more conspicuous than in the excuses he has offered for his now notorious letter to Mr. Deane. His rope is woven of three threads. Our object just at the present moment is to draw attention to the danger incurred by Mr. Gladstone's eager supporters, who, less sublimed than he, endeavour to expound his views to the multitude. The liberty of a sect is one thing, and the liberty of English members of a sect is another. If anybody threatens the religious liberty of an English Roman Catholic, it is the duty of the Executive to interfere, but the Pope is not an English Roman Catholic, nor is he in England. The United States are said to be threatening Brigham Young's independence in Utah, and it is quite possible that United States soldiers may before long put an end to the reign of the prophet. According to the *Daily Telegraph*, Mr. Gladstone ought to interfere, for there are Mormons in England. But what does Mr. Gladstone himself think of the matter?"

THE MURDER OF SCOTT.

Mr. RYMAL said that before the Speaker left the chair he had an amendment to move, which was as follows:—"That this House regrets that the Government of the day have done nothing towards procuring the punishment of the murderers of Thomas Scott, and that an humble address be presented to his Excellency praying that he will take such steps and make such representations as will be the best calculated to bring these men to justice." He proceeded, in a vigorous speech, to support his amendment. He complained that the murderers of Scott were allowed to walk the streets unmolested at Fort Garry. In the portion of Ontario from which he (Mr. Rymal) came there was a determination that justice should be meted out to the men who basely and brutally murdered Scott. He (Mr. Rymal) was the last man who would appeal to the prejudices of race or creed, and, in this case, he simply demanded that even-handed justice should be done. (Hear, hear.) He thought the loyal portion of the people in Manitoba had good grounds of complaint in regard to the distribution of Government patronage there. It was a poor reward for all their sufferings that they should have been ignored, and those who had aided the insurrection rewarded with offices of honour and emolument. The very worst of the bad acts of this Government were their distribution of patronage. This was shown the other night in reference to Nova Scotia. Referring to that matter for a moment he said that after the shameless avowal of premeditated prostitution of the Government patronage by one of the members of the Government, if his Excellency was the high-minded nobleman he believed him to be, he would be no longer advised by such a one of such a one approached him for the purpose of giving advice, he would say to him as our Saviour said to a certain personage: "Get thee behind me Satan." Referring again to the murder of Scott, he said if no attempt was made to bring the murderers to justice, British power and British justice were a mockery.

Sir G. CARTIER said the members of the Government must deplore the murder of that poor man Scott. It had been said but said wrongly, that the people of Quebec sympathized with the murderers of Scott. Every one in Lower Canada deplored and detested that awful deed, but he (Sir G. Cartier) thought that this motion should not have been put before the House. He hoped that the members of both sides of the House would join with him in condemning the matter of the motion as well as the manner of the mover. The murder was committed when Red River was not under the jurisdiction of Canada, and the courts there at the present time had sole power in criminal matters. This Parliament had conferred criminal jurisdiction on the courts in Manitoba, and this Government had no more power to interfere in a case of murder there than it would have in case of a murder in Ontario. As to the question of patronage, that matter was also under the sole control of the Local Government. There were only two appointments the Government could make there—one was the Lieutenant-Governor, and the other the Recorder of Manitoba. He hoped this would be the last motion they would have in this House on this subject. He hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw his motion.

Mr. RYMAL said he did not believe in shams, and would not withdraw his motion. He would like to ask the Minister of Militia why, if the Government had no authority to take cognizance of anything that happened in Red River previous to that territory being ceded to us, were they called on to pay the war losses? When Mr. McGee was murdered in Ontario the Dominion Government offered rewards for the apprehension of the assassin and feed and retained counsel for examining into the matter. Why could they not do the same in the case of Scott?

Sir G. CARTIER said that the Federal Government had offered a reward for the apprehension of Mr. McGee's murderer because he had not left the city; but in the case of those implicated in the murder of Scott what would be the use of offering a reward when they were in foreign parts?

Mr. BLAKE—Hear, hear.

Sir G. CARTIER said that in the case of Mr. McGee it was the Local Government that had charge of arresting and trying the murderer.

Mr. BOWELL fully concurred in the sentiment of the motion, but would much rather it had come up in another form. He himself had a motion on the subject, but the mover had taken his own course, and he (Mr. BOWELL) would vote for the motion. The speaker proceeded to criticize the appointments made by Lieutenant-Governor Archibald, and complained that some of those implicated in the murder of Scott had actually been scrutineers at the late elections. Amongst those scrutineers was Lepine, Riel's Adjutant-General. Without an amnesty having been granted, it was a disgrace to the British name that such things should exist. He could not but believe that Governor Archibald had received some instructions from the Dominion Government, and it was well known that disloyal men have been appointed to office and loyal men discouraged. He would now repeat what he had stated last year,—that the root of the whole difficulty was originally in the Hudson's Co. He proceeded to criticize the appointments made in Red River, referring particularly to Bannantyne, the post-master, who had sympathized with the rebels and tampered with the letters of loyalty; to O'Donnell, one of Riel's council who had been appointed to the Legislative Council; to Spence, who had been appointed Clerk of the Legislative Council; and to other appointments of that character. Then there was Attorney-General Clarke.

Sir G. CARTIER—I had nothing to do with him.

Mr. BOWELL—Then he must have been appointed by that high-minded man whom this Government had appointed Lieutenant-Governor. He thought this Government should, in regard to British honour at least, either have asked the Crown to grant a total amnesty, or should have asked the Crown for the extradition of the murderer of Scott.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he was not surprised at the course taken by

the hon. member for Wentworth; but he was surprised that the hon. member for North Hastings should lend himself to the motion, especially as the hon. member for West Durham had declared that this Government had no power to interfere in criminal matters in Red River.

Mr. BLAKE said he never made any such declaration.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER wanted to know, then, why the hon. gentleman had left it, in the last days of the session, to the hon. member for Wentworth to bring this matter up? It was because he had too much regard for his high reputation as a lawyer that he remained silent on the subject. He (Dr. Tupper) proceeded to argue that, a Constitutional Government could not do anything towards executing criminal law there. He characterized the present motion as one brought forward for party purposes; and then proceeded to eulogize Lieutenant-Governor Archibald, his (Dr. Tupper's) political antagonist for many years, and to defend Governor Archibald's appointment, claiming the result was that peace and order now reigned in that country. He (Dr. Tupper) denied emphatically that the Dominion Government had any authority to act in the case of the murder of Scott.

Hon. Mr. WOOD took issue with the Minister of Militia and the President of the Council as to the authority of the Dominion Government in cases like that of Scott. Ever since the year 1803 the Government of Lower Canada had jurisdiction over crimes committed in the North-West. (Hear, hear.) In 1818 trials took place in Toronto of two men, Brown and Boucher, who had committed crimes in the North-West. These men were tried under the Imperial Act of 1833, and he was not aware that it had been repealed. Under a compact with the Imperial Government the Hudson Bay Company were bound under a penalty of £5,000 sgd. to arrest criminals in that territory. Under the third section of the British North America Act power to interfere in a case like that of Scott was vested in the Governor-General of the Dominion in Council; in other words the powers of the Act of 1803 were transferred. (Hear, hear.) With these facts in view, what became of the splendid fabric of trash and nonsense? (Applause.) A member of the Government speaking with such emphasis and repetition as the President of the Council had spoken, should be sure of his facts before he ventured the opinion to which he had treated the House. (Hear, hear.) Aside from that, the Governor-General, since the commission of the crime, could have appointed a person there to take information and apprehend the guilty parties and hand them over to the proper authorities. It was therefore, true that the Dominion Government had all the time authority and jurisdiction over this great crime. The President of the Council had declared that murder conceived with high treason did not come within the extradition treaty. That was something new to him. Treason, of course, did not; but when a man deliberately planned and executed a murder the extradition treaty would not shield him merely because, in addition to being a murderer, he was a traitor. No civilized Government would ever offer to plead that, because the party was a rebel and a traitor, he was not to be brought to justice for crime against not merely his own country but against all nations and humanity everywhere. Again, by an order in Council, the North-West territory was transferred to Canada, and along with it the obligation of preserving the peace and punishing crime; and since that time the Dominion had, unquestionable, jurisdiction and authority over a crime of this kind committed there. It was only now that the Government were getting an Act passed extending the criminal laws of the Dominion to Manitoba. It was, therefore, clear that from the commission of the crime down to the present time the Dominion Government, and they only, had jurisdiction over this crime, and in the eye of the law no one but that Government was responsible for the non-execution of the law.

Sir G. E. CARTIER related the trial of an Indian many years ago in Lower Canada, before Judge Vallieres. The Indian had committed a murder in the Hudson Bay territory, and was condemned to death but released afterwards on the plea of want of territorial jurisdiction. He went on to argue that the Governor-General under the British North America Act had no jurisdiction in the case of the Scott murderers.

Mr. D. A. SMITH said after the expedition entered Fort Garry a number of persons came to him (Mr. Smith) and wanted to be sworn in as special constables. They said they wanted to go after the murderers of Scott; but, as they said themselves, if it was a chicken-broth sort of thing, they would have nothing to do with it. They wanted warrants for murder, and said if they got them they would shoot down those concerned in the murder of Scott. He (Mr. Smith) refused the warrants. (Ironical hear, hear.) After the troops had entered Fort Garry warrants were issued for the arrest of Riel, Lepine, and O'Donohue, but they made their escape. The speaker then proceeded to defend Spence and Bannantyne, the latter of whom, he asserted, had not opened letters. He knew, however, one person who did open letters.

Mr. BOWELL.—Why not give his name?

Dr. SCHULTZ said he had not intended to say anything on this subject, but after the remarks of the member for Selkirk, he felt bound to say a few words. He was not in Manitoba at the time the troops arrived, but he had conclusive evidence on the subject of the granting of warrants for the apprehension of Riel, O'Donohue, and Lepine. He proceeded to read an affidavit from one Thomas Luston, to the effect that on the 24th of last August he was informed by the Reverend George Young that if he wanted a warrant for the apprehension of these men, Donald A. Smith, would see that it was executed; that upon receipt of this information he had endeavoured to procure a warrant, but had been refused; and that he verily believed that Donald A. Smith, did not wish to execute a warrant, and was anxious that Riel, O'Donohue, and Lepine, should have ample time to escape.

Mr. D. A. SMITH repeated his previous statement as to the application for warrants, and his refusal.

Mr. WHITE (Halton) Why did you not issue the warrants?

Mr. D. A. SMITH—Because I did not think I had authority.

Mr. BLAKE, said the question before the House was whether it was properly called on to express regret at the action of the Government in the past, and to ask his Excellency to take such steps as would secure justice in the future. It had been argued that the Government had no power in the territory; but was it not a fact that the Governor-General had issued an order anterior to the murder of Scott, to this effect, that if the people returned to their homes he (the Governor-General) would order that no proceedings should be taken against them?

Sir GEO. CARTIER.—The order to do that came from England by telegraph.

Mr. BLAKE asserted that the telegram referred to granted no such authority. This document, as a proclamation, was not issued by the Governor-General acting under the direct command of the Queen, but acting under the advice of his Ministry, and it was counter-signed by H. L. Langevin. (Hear, hear.) That was anterior to the murder of Scott. He declared that the Dominion had power to establish courts in Manitoba for the better execution of the criminal law; and if the criminal law be not executed, if British justice was not to be done in that territory, if one of those murderers were living in the Territory and no steps were to be taken to bring them to justice, then it was the duty of the Dominion Government to have brought down to the House a proposition for the establishment of a court where British justice would be done and those men brought to trial. What was the use of passing criminal laws if they could not enforce them? The Dominion Government had power to enforce them. He held that Riel being guilty of murder, was subject to extradition; at any rate the Government should have made an attempt to have him extradited. He instanced the case of Burleigh, who was demanded by United States Government when the United States were at war with the Southern States, to show that extradition should have been demanded in the case of Riel. (Here, hear.) But setting all these views of the question aside, there was another view: this country being responsible in a large sense for the lives and liberties of many of the people of Canada who had emigrated to Red River, sent a Commissioner on a mission of conciliation; and while that mission was in progress a Canadian was taken and brutally murdered by the man who assumed to hold authority there at the time. Under the circumstances were they to be told that, a premeditated insult being inflicted upon this country nothing at all could be done by Canada to secure the punishment of the guilty parties? In the case of the murder of Mr. McGee the Dominion Government had applied to the Attorney-General of Ontario to issue a special commission for the trial of the murderers of McGee. If the Government had the power to do that, then had they not power to apply to the Governor of Manitoba to bring these parties to trial? The more so, as in this case, not only was justice concerned but the honour and good faith of this country and they could have brought this pressure to bear upon the Manitoba