

be no imputation against their loyalty. (*Hear, hear.*) Further, he might say that he fully believed that there were none who deplored the sad events of last winter more than the people of Red River, not only the English, but the French-speaking population of Red River. (*Cheers.*)

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) said the hon. member had distinctly stated that he did not know who composed the Court Martial. If so, how did he know that the hon. member for Provencher was not a member of it. (*Cries of Oh, oh! and confusion.*)

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS: It is entirely out of order. The hon. member has asked a question and got a reply. What more does he want?

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. member for Prince Edward's was quite in order. He had but called attention to the fact that the hon. member for Selkirk had not in this particular corroborated the statement.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North) moved the following resolution:—That Mr. Walter Ross, Member of the House of Commons, for the County of Prince Edward, having stated in his place that there were rumours, that Pierre Delorme, who on the 5th day of April instant was introduced and took his seat in this House as Member for Provencher in the Province of Manitoba had been concerned in the rebellion against the authority by Law established in the Hudson's Bay Territories, which was lately quelled by Her Majesty's Troops, and moreover that he was directly implicated in the murder of one Thomas Scott, a British subject, by persons in arms against the authority of the Crown in that Territory, and the said Pierre Delorme, Esq., having stated in his place, that the said charges were utterly unfounded and untrue.

Resolved, That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the truth of these allegations, and if the charges should be sustained, to report the proceedings which ought to be taken in order to relieve this House from the disgrace and dishonour of receiving amongst its Members any one guilty of such offences; the said Committee to consist of the Hon. Messieurs Morris and Dorion, Messieurs Street and Macdonald (Glengarry), the Hon. Mr. Cameron (Peel), and Messieurs Blake and Gibbs.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North) said if it were true that the hon. member for Provencher had not been connected with Riel's Council it should be proved and made plain in the most public manner. He did not think that the mere statement made by the hon. member himself in such an imperfect way was sufficient. He thought there was none who should be more anxious than the hon. member himself that a Committee should be appointed to investigate the matter and report to this House. The hon. member for Selkirk would see when his speech was published that his statements were not quite in conformity with some of the facts which had been made public respecting this North West difficulty.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said the discussion was out of order. The hon. member should give due notice before moving a resolution.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North) said it was perfectly obvious that if a notice of two days were required this matter could not be investigated this session.

The SPEAKER ruled that it rested with the House to decide whether the resolution could be moved without notice.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER moved in amendment to Hon. Mr. McDougall's motion that the matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to be considered forthwith.

Mr. BLAKE said the distinct statements made by the hon. members for Provencher and Selkirk were quite satisfactory to his own mind. (*Hear, hear.*) He thought that the country owed a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for bringing up this matter in the House. It appeared to him that the distinct statements of the hon. gentlemen opposite were quite enough, and that there was no necessity for the appointment of a committee. However, he did not at all object to having it investigated by a Committee. He deprecated any attempt at turning the wicked, unprovoked, damnable murder which had occurred in the North West into a matter of nationality or creed. It was one that had not been looked after by the constituted authorities of this country, and he believed they would receive the condemnation of all classes in this Dominion for having neglected to punish the murderers. He had not taken any steps thus far in the matter because when he had brought it up in the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, it had there been declared that the House had no right to take any action in the matter. When he had failed there, where the public were unanimous in condemning the murderers, he had little hope of being successful in this House. He thought he would leave it to those who had thought proper to impute to him improper motives in bringing it up in the Local Legislatures.

Mr. JONES (Leeds North and Grenville North) charged the member for Durham West with heartlessness in trying to make political capital out of the murder of Scott. The hon. member had the hardihood to bring it up in the Local Legislature, but here, where there was a large proportion of French representatives, he did not dare to bring it up here.

Mr. FERGUSON said the Local Legislature of Ontario was not the right place to bring up a matter of this kind. Here, in this Parliament, was the place to discuss the matter, and here the hon. member should force the matter on the attention of the Executive instead of bringing his buncombe resolutions up in a House that had nothing to do with the case.

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) said the hon. member for Lanark North, who seemed to take upon himself the championship of the North West people, had declared that the statements he (Mr. Smith) had made would not be borne out by facts. He merely wished to say in reply that he could substantiate every statement he had made.

Hon. Mr. DORION said if proof was necessary to corroborate the denial of the hon. member for Provencher, none better could be asked for than that furnished by the hon. member for Selkirk. Yet,