

Supposing now that we were called upon to pronounce upon a proposition that the law had not been justly carried out. The fair answer to that proposition would be: we have nothing to do with that here. We have nothing to do with the question whether or not the Executive at Ottawa has or has not done right in a matter affecting the administration of justice. In a matter outside of this Province, in a matter having nothing to do with the administration of justice in our Province, I think it would be

A FAIR ANSWER

to say that this House would be taking upon itself to deal with matters with which it ought not to deal. The less that we undertake of matters purely and wholly of a Dominion character, the better it will be for all of us. (Hear, hear.) We could of course make a recommendation

THAT MERCY SHOULD BESHOWN,

as any authoritative body might do, either within, or I might say without, the Dominion. I can see by the smile that beams on the faces of some of my friends opposite that they think they are going to gain some party advantage by bringing into what appears to be a recommendation of mercy, something which may be made use of elsewhere, in order to show that we had pronounced upon certain other matters. But I say that when we, as a deliberative body, will be called upon to pronounce as to the justice or injustice of what may have occurred in the execution of the law, it is perfectly plain, that before we can come to any decision—supposing it is a reasonable thing to discuss the question at all—we must have

ALL THE FACTS BEFORE US.

Before we can say I am not going to shirk the point, before we can be called upon to pronounce whether the execution of the chief rebel was just, we should have, for instance, the report of the Medical Commission; because it is admitted that if the result of the Medical Commission was that he was found to be insane, it would not have been right to carry out such an act at all. I make these suggestions knowing nothing of the facts at all. But these are all good reasons why this Legislature should not,

FOR A PARTY PURPOSE,

intervene and interfere in a matter which is to be discussed and dealt with elsewhere, and which is outside of our proper forum. (Applause.) Our recommendation to mercy may amount to something, but our pronouncing upon these other matters will amount to nothing at all. And therefore I say that the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment is not acting fairly in the interests of those for whom he professes to want mercy. If he wants mercy and clemency to be extended to these prisoners; if he wishes for peace and good order, and all that may follow from a lenient carrying out of the law; if he wants this House to make an unanimous recommendation to mercy, he is not taking the right course. (Applause.) He is subverting that purpose to serve some party end. (Cheers.) I do not suppose there is a man in this House, whatever his politics or religion, who would not willingly join him in a recommendation for mercy. But when one who

PROFESSES TO BE A FRIEND

to those in prison attempts to introduce into his action something which may make it necessary for the House to reject it, then he has destroyed the object which he professes to have at heart. (Cheers.) He can get a recommendation of mercy from this House. But he must not, under that guise, endeavour to serve a party purpose or a party end. So far as I am concerned, I shall have no hesitation, if this amendment is pressed, in voting against it. Because I say that if you undertake to decide here upon a matter not tried in our Courts, having no connection with our laws—if you undertake to say here that a particular course taken by the authorities at Ottawa has been just and proper, with reference to a thing that does not concern us at all as a Province—you would always have the right to review the action taken at Ottawa in reference to the administration of justice. On grounds of reason, on the grounds of what is expedient and proper, with every wish to see the House join in a recommendation to mercy. I have no hesitation whatever in telling my hon. friend that if he will not withdraw his amendment I will put upon him the responsibility of having

PREVENTED THE EXPRESSION

of a desire for mercy by upholding an element which should never have been introduced. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. BALFOUR, referring to the Boundary Award, said that last session the Dominion Government had presented to the House only a small portion of the papers on the Boundary case, Sir John had shown no anxiety to deal with the question. The member for North Essex, when he complained of

certain epithets, such as "Slap him on the back," being applied to the Indians, must surely have forgotten that these phrases originated with the First Minister at Ottawa. The Minister of Agriculture was much to be congratulated on the establishment of

FARMERS' INSTITUTES,

which had done much good in the past, and would, he expected, do still more good in the future. In the county of Essex the interests of farmers had suffered very severely from the swine pest, and he hoped that the Minister of Agriculture would take measures for the eradication of such diseases. He had hoped to see in the Speech a reference to the University question, and in this connection he wished to state that he believed Upper Canada College should be abolished. He was glad to observe that the confidence of the people in the Government had been so signally marked since the general election. Immediately after that election the Government had a majority of 12; to-day they had a majority of 19. In West Middlesex we had a change of 200 votes in favour of the Government. Mr. Dowling's majority of 100 was increased to 700. Mr. Lyons' majority of 138 was increased to 1,000. West Algoma, which formerly gave a Conservative majority, returned a Reformer. In East Kent the Reform candidate was elected by acclamation. The Government need not care for the unfair criticism of the Opposition, so long as they had such proofs of the increasing confidence of the people—(applause)—and to retain that confidence the Government had only to act as they had acted for the past fourteen years. (Cheers.)

AN AMENDMENT SUGGESTED.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—I have to suggest to the hon. gentleman that he withdraw his motion and allow the following motion to be passed:—

And this House now hopefully trusts that peace and tranquillity having been fully restored I may be found consistent with the public interests to extend the merciful consideration of the Crown to those who are now undergoing imprisonment for offences connected with or arising out of the rebellion.

If the hon. gentleman is willing to further the purpose which he says he desires, there will be no trouble in gaining the unanimous consent of the House to such a motion as I have suggested. If not, he drags into this arena all those questions of the North-west trouble—all that followed and all that preceded the rebellion—and I do hope that he will see that this is a discussion which this House should not proceed with, and which it must proceed with if this motion be pressed.

Mr. WHITE—I cannot accept this amendment. If my hon. friend does not approve of my motion he will vote against it.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Very well.

Mr. WATERS dealt at some length with the question of the taking over of the Provincial Railways by the Dominion. He pointed out that the Provinces had expended large sums on these railways and had incurred liabilities which were not yet paid. Matters being in this position he believed the Province had no right to spend another dollar in granting aid to railways. They were things which no longer came under the

JURISDICTION OF THE PROVINCES.

They had no more right to spend money on them than on postoffices or custom houses, or wharves or canals. He trusted no proposition for aid would come before the House; if it did, he should vote against it. As to the Boundary Award, he said that if Sir John Macdonald had ratified it there would have been no trouble about it. The Ontario Government had no intention of depriving Indians of their just rights. The question was one of resistance to the claims of the Dominion. He did not approve of the proposal for a Provincial audit for the accounts of municipalities. He thought the Government should prepare and publish a statement of the exports of Ontario, as the Dominion trade and navigation returns were misleading. The report for 1883 made it appear that only a small portion of the cattle export of the Dominion was from Ontario. Discussing the question of the

NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,

he said that when it was found that \$500,000 would not answer the purpose last session an additional \$250,000 was voted. He was not in a position to say that \$750,000 is enough. But it was the opinion of his constituents that if that is not sufficient that the plans should be brought down to that figure. No doubt the Government could succeed in doing that. The willingness and alacrity with which the Volunteers went to the North-west to quell the late rebellion made manifest the conviction of the people of Canada, that whatever the grievance might be they must and could be remedied by constitutional means. The manner in