April 10, 1871

in the fact of all this an hon. member rose in his place and moved a resolution to try an hon. member on a mere rumour. It was most unfair at this late hour of the session to treat any member of this House in such an unfair manner—to send him home with the imputation hanging over him that he was guilty of so great a crime that it was found necessary to bring him to trial. There was no positive declaration that the hon. member had done anything wrong and the House should be very careful, therefore, before proceeding to such an unjudicial act. He hoped the hon. member for Lanark would withdraw his motion. If not, he (Hon. Mr. Dorion) would move an amendment to it, that there was no case to bring before a Committee of this House.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said this discussion only proved how right he (Hon. Sir George-É. Cartier) was in raising a point of order at the outset. He knew very well that there was no actual charge to proceed upon. He merely moved his amendment to show that the Government had no hesitation in giving the best opportunity of investigating the matter. The view taken by the hon. member for Hochelaga was the view taken by the Government, but they did not wish to give any pretext whatever for a charge against the members for Quebec, that they wished to screen a man who had been guilty of a crime, from justice.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North) said that he would not withdraw his motion, believing as he did, that it was in the interests of this House and of the country that this case should be investigated by a committee. He dissented entirely from the doctrine propounded by the hon. member for Hochelaga, that the statement of an hon. member, affecting himself, should be accepted without discussion. He had no desire to see the hon. member found guilty, but he would show the House a photograph of Riel's Privy Council, in which the picture of the hon. member for Provencher appeared in proof of the statement of the hon. member for Prince Edward. There was a Pierre Delorme, a member of that Council; was it the hon. member for Provencher? The hon. gentleman might not have been one of those implicated in the murder, but there had been no proof, except the hon. gentleman's own statement, that he never had been a member of Riel's Council. The hon. member for Selkirk did not corroborate that denial, and there was every ground, therefore, for investigating the case.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said some hon. member must take upon himself the responsibility of reading some direct charge against the hon. member for Provencher before putting him on his trial. On no other ground could a Committee be granted.

Mr. DELORME (Provencher) said he had no objections to have the matter tried. He was present with a number of Indians when the photograph in the hands of the hon. member for Lanark was taken and his picture was among the number, but there were several there who were not connected with the Council and his picture was among these latter.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Peel) argued that the House could not grant a Committee to whom to refer a mere rumour, which was contradicted by the hon. member whom it affected. It would be establishing a pernicious precedent to carry this motion.

Mr. DELORME (Provencher): I never was a member of Riel's Council.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings East) said if the hon. member for Durham West had pursued the same course in this Legislature that he had followed in the Local House, he (Mr. White) would have aided him to the best of his ability in pressing upon the government the necessity of punishing the murderer of Scott. He (Mr. White) believed the hon. members who were so anxious to prevent the appointment of a Committee to investigate this matter, desired to make political capital out of it. He would vote for the original motion.

Mr. FERGUSON would support the motion of the hon. member for Lanark on the same ground.

Hon. Mr. DORION moved an amendment, reciting the points brought out in the discussion and resolving that no case had been made out for sending this case to a Committee. He stated that he held in his hand a copy of the photograph which had been referred to by the hon. member for Lanark, and there appeared in it the portraits of Mr. Spence and other gentlemen who were known to have never been connected with Riel's Council. (*Hear, hear.*)

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) corroborated the statement of the hon. member for Hochelaga respecting the photograph.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) thought that the discussion should be brought to a close, and hoped the hon. member for Lisgar would inform the House what he knew of the matter.

Mr. SCHULTZ said he had not purposed to speak of the matter of all. He would vote for the amendment of the Hon. Minister of Militia, and when the case came before the Committee, he would tell all that he knew about the matter. He might say now, however, that when Riel's Council was in session, he (Mr. Schultz) was in prison, and that when Scott's murder took place, he (Mr. Schultz) was making his way towards Lake Superior.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he would have preferred to allow this matter to stand over till next session, but, under the circumstances, he saw nothing for it but to vote for the motion of the Hon. Minister of Militia, especially as the hon. member for Provencher had asked for the appointment of a Committee.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said there was but one view to take of it. Was there any case to bring before the Committee? He had not heard any made out, and whether the hon. member for Provencher desired to have his case sent before a Committee or not, the House should consider the matter as it stood, quite irrespective of the wishes of any member in this House.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER quite agreed with the remarks which had just fallen from the hon. member for Châteauguay. He challenged the hon. member for Lanark to find a precedent in British