

# ONTARIO LEGISLATURE

## Fifth Parliament --- Third Session.

TUESDAY, February 2.

(By Our Own Reporters.)

The Speaker took the chair at three o'clock.

### NEW MEMBER.

Mr. Lyon, M.P.P. for East Algoma, was introduced by Hon. G. W. Ross and Mr. H. P. O'Connor.

### DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

Hon. O. MOWAT arose amid cheers to continue the debate on the Address. He said:—I desire to say a few words on the amendment proposed by the member for North Essex, the object of which is to induce this House to place on record an opinion favourable to the executive action of the Dominion Government in matters which followed the

#### INSURRECTION IN THE NORTH-WEST.

I do not propose to discuss the matter to which that amendment refers, at any length. But I wish to say enough upon it to indicate the position which I take with reference to it. I observe, at the outset, that it is very curious to find such a resolution proposed by an hon. member of the Opposition when I remember what course was taken by the Conservative press on an occasion in some respects similar to the present. After the former troubles in the North-west, and when the public mind was greatly agitated in consequence of the murder of Scott, one of our citizens there—agitated also because no steps whatever were taken to arrest the perpetrators or to bring them to trial—different though the circumstances were in that there was a practical object in this Legislature taking some action—yet any proceeding of that kind was deprecated by the Conservative press of this country. Now the matter is one over which we have no control—a matter with which we have nothing to do. It is not one of those things in regard to which there is a unanimous opinion among us all—(oh!)—and therefore in which, if it is an important enough matter, we may all unite in some action. No, Sir, the object of this amendment is to do

▲ SERVICE TO THE DOMINION GOVERNMENT at Ottawa. (Loud cheers.) There is no other possible object. In the form of the resolution it would seem as if the primary object was to express a desire that mercy should be shown to those persons who are now suffering imprisonment under the sentence passed upon them in consequence of their connection with the rebellion. But my hon. friend who moved the amendment (Mr. White) has in effect disclaimed that as his object—he was told by my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Mr. Fraser), that so far as that object was concerned we might be unanimous. He did not care for that. He did not want that. He wished the resolution to contain an expression of approbation for the executive action of its friends at Ottawa. Well, now, we are not going to do that. (Loud cheers). We are not going

#### TO PLAY INTO THE HANDS

of the Conservative party at Ottawa. There is no sort of ground on which we can offer them the least assistance in regard to this matter. In a much stronger case, the Conservatives of the period to which I refer, under a very able leader, pronounced this opinion:—“That it would be unwise and inexpedient to interfere with the prerogative which properly belongs to another Government, and to discuss a question over which the House has no control.” (Hear, hear.) The hon. member has either forgotten all that or he takes

#### AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT VIEW

of our duty. He thinks it is our duty to interfere with a prerogative belonging to another Government, and to discuss questions over which we have no control.

Mr. MERRICK—That was an amendment, was it not?

Hon. O. MOWAT—Do I understand that my hon. friend votes for an amendment whether he believes in it or not? I understand an amendment as expressing an opinion as decisively as a substantive motion. (Hear, hear.) With reference to the particular matter on which we are now asked to record our opinion, it is a matter on which there is a known difference of opinion in various parts of the country so far as relates