

from the North-West Territories has no more connection with the functions of this House or the politics of the country than a case coming from the Province of Quebec or the Province of Nova Scotia. Before I refer to the criticisms which were passed upon the trial of the case, and as one of the preliminary observations I wish to make, I desire to reply to a remark which was made by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), the other evening. Replying to a remark of the Minister of Public Works, he asked how the Minister of Inland Revenue, and how the Minister of Justice could reconcile with truth the statement which had been made in this House that there had been a change in public opinion in the Province of Quebec? He referred to the meetings which had taken place at St. Jerome and St. Colombe, at which I had the honor of assisting, and at the latter of which my hon. colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue, was with me. The hon. gentleman wanted to know what we had to say, after those meetings, of the state of feeling in the Province of Quebec? I answer that if we are to judge from what we saw, there had been a great change of feeling in the Province of Quebec. The people were disposed to listen to reason, to argument, and to truth, and there was no more passion evinced at those meetings than at any meetings of equal size called in any other part of the country, for the discussion of public questions. If I had to judge from the reports we saw in the press, I should have to give the hon. gentleman a different answer; but at present I shall testify from what I saw, not from what I read in the papers afterwards. I should think the hon. gentleman would have hesitated to ask me, in the presence of this House, what I thought of the change of public feeling in the Province of Quebec, when we have so many witnesses to cite on the floor of this House. We know that a few days after the execution, in the city of Montreal a set of resolutions were passed declaring that this execution was a base murder, and that the three Ministers representing that Province in the Cabinet were men who had degraded their race and were traitors to their country. Resolutions were passed declaring that this was a crime which should never be forgiven; and the hon. gentlemen in this House, some of whom have addressed it already and some of whom are to follow me, were the men who, in the presence of fifty thousand of their fellow-countrymen, secured the unanimous adoption of these resolutions. Yet those gentlemen, in the course of this debate, have risen and declared that the information before the House is not sufficient to enable them to vote, not for a resolution that the execution was a murder, not for a resolution that we are traitors, not for a resolution declaring that we shall never be forgiven, but for a resolution expressing in the mildest terms a regret that the law was allowed to take its course. In fact so mildly was the resolution worded that it excited the suspicion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and he declared that the Government must have drawn this indictment. I wish to make one other preliminary observation, an observation with regard to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) in respect of a matter in which, I think, he did me, unconsciously, an injustice. About ten minutes before this debate began, when the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) was about to take the floor, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), without having given any notice of his question, rose and asked a question involving a number of details, as to whether the medical reports from Regina had been received by telegraph, and if so, at what date, and would they be brought before the House, and involving other particulars as well. I stated that I was unable from memory to answer the question on the spot, presuming the hon. gentleman would, as he subsequently did, put it in writing, and give me an opportunity to furnish the particulars asked for. I thought that it was somewhat ungenerous on the part of the hon. gentleman (but it pro-

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish).

ably was due to his misunderstanding my answer), when he said that members of the Government were so disposed to trifle with this great question and with the wishes of the House itself, that when they were asked a vital question the answer was that they could not remember. He forgot he was asking a question involving particulars which could not be stated without looking at the documents themselves, or the records of the Department, and of which he had not given any notice, and that therefore he could not expect the information to be at once supplied. The hon. gentleman had been in this House two weeks of the Session; he had already asked for papers of almost every description, and if it had occurred to him to put his question a little earlier than ten minutes before the debate began, I should have been in a position to say something more definite than that I was not able to answer from memory. We have had the point raised and pressed with great earnestness, that the trial was an unfair one, and we have heard it asserted by a member of the legal profession, that although it was a legal trial it was not a fair one. I confess, after having given that observation all the reflection I have since been able to give it, I am unable to understand it; I am unable to understand how the Executive can be condemned for not having given to the prisoner something more than the law gave him, as regards the procedure in this trial. We have generally understood, throughout this Empire, that a synonym for fair play as regards the administration of criminal justice was British law, and yet we are told now, for the first time, in a Parliament existing under British institutions, that the Government are to be condemned because their counsel conducted the trial in such a way, that although strictly in accordance with the law, it was an unfair trial. Now, let me ask the House to bear with me for a few moments while I address it upon those points in respect of which it was said the trial was unfair. We were told by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that the judges were inferior judges. I presume he meant, technically, that they were judges of an inferior court, and not that he meant to impugn their professional standing or abilities as members of the judicial bench. But that is an entirely irrelevant enquiry. The jurisdiction, whether the courts be superior or inferior, is plainly conferred upon them by law; the law of the country requires that, whether these be superior or inferior judges, they should take cognisance of cases like this. It has been said that the courts there were peculiar in their organisation. That criticism, pointing, as I suppose it did, to the conclusion that the trial was unfair and unsatisfactory, for otherwise it would be what the hon. gentleman distinctly said it was not, a purely theoretical objection, a purely theoretical criticism—his criticism pointing to such a conclusion, induced me to bring to the House the provisions of the law on that subject. In 1875, a case of this kind would not have been tried by the judges who, he says, are inferior. The provision of section 64 of the Act of 1875 gave the trial of capital cases to the Chief Justice or any Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Manitoba, and required the intervention of a jury not exceeding eight in number. In 1867, that Statute was altered; the jurisdiction of the chief justice and of the judges of Manitoba was taken away and given to stipendiary magistrates to be appointed in those territories, and the number of jurors was reduced from eight to six. It is true the hon. member might have pressed upon us one other consideration, and that is, that then there would have been present, even under the Act of 1877, upon the bench, not merely the stipendiary magistrate but two justices of the peace as well. I take it that that is an objection which the hon. gentleman himself and his followers lay very little stress upon; because we have not had, from the beginning to the end of this discussion, the complaint that there have been too few justices of the peace to try this man, but we have had only the com-