

(Mr. MASSON) supposed the hon. gentleman and his friends had in this matter acted quite conscientiously, and that they desired to do what was right. They seemed to feel that the position in which they were placed was not exactly what they could wish it to be; and their conduct reminded him of the husband who went home late, and in order to be saved a scolding began himself to scold his wife. The hon. Minister knew that the solution of the question proposed by the Government would not please his friends in Lower Canada, that there was a strong feeling existing there against their policy on the question now before the House, and he (the MINISTER) desired that something should be said or done which would remove the remembrance of these things from the public mind. His plan appeared to be a general attack upon the Conservative party in Manitoba and Lower Canada. He (Mr. MASSON) had avoided reproaching gentlemen upon the other side of the House, and had indeed been guarded in what he said. He did not make any attack upon hon. members, or if anything he said had been so construed, it was quite foreign to his intention. What he had said was that if Mr. RIEL did not come forward for his trial, it was due to the action of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. They had promised that an amnesty would be forthcoming, as gentlemen upon this side of the House had promised an amnesty, and in consequence of that statement Mr. RIEL had not come forward. Surely that was no attack upon the hon. gentleman or his friends. He (Mr. MASSON) had referred to the outlawry because the Minister of Justice had argued that those who had voted against the expulsion last year—and would have a difficulty in voting otherwise this year—could vote for the issue of a new writ consistently, and thus relieve themselves from the consequences which a direct reversal of last year's vote would necessarily entail in Lower Canada. He (Mr. MASSON) believed that members on the other side of the House from the Province of Quebec wished for a complete amnesty, but preferred to vote for what had been described by an hon. member as a "mongrel motion" rather than permit the gentlemen upon this (the Opposition) side of the House to go over to that.

*Mr. Masson.*

Hon. Mr. FOURNIER said he had not been quite fairly represented by the hon. member for Terrebonne. What he had said was that, while in no measure receding from the position he, like other hon. members, had taken on this question last year, the position in which Mr. RIEL was now placed, and the position in which the House found itself in regard to him, was entirely different from what it had formerly been. The law now pointed out the course they were bound to pursue. There was to be found upon the records of this House a precedent for the action about to be taken. An hon. member had in that case been expelled because he was a fugitive from justice. Outlawry amounted to the same thing as a conviction, and involved the same consequences. The motion before the House was based upon the legal consequences of the sentence of outlawry, by the operation of which Mr. RIEL had become disqualified to hold a seat in this House. He did not believe there was a single member in the House prepared to deny the legal proposition that Mr. RIEL, being outlawed, he was disqualified from taking his seat.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON said he understood the Minister of Justice to mean that if the House had expelled Mr. RIEL last year, there were greater grounds for his expulsion this year.

Hon. Mr. FOURNIER repeated that he had not departed from the position he took last year, but the fact of RIEL's outlawry left no course except that which it was proposed the House should now take.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Inverness) said there were two points which it was the duty of the House to consider. First, there were the facts and the evidence which were before them, and in the second place there was the authority of the court before which the process of outlawry had been taken. The question of fact and of evidence was not one for this hon. House to consider. There was but one tribunal which could take cognizance of the matter, and until the sentence had been reversed by that tribunal, it stood good in all tribunals. So far it had not been set aside, and the House was bound to regard it as legal and proper. With regard to the authority of the tribunal, the case quoted by the right hon., the leader of the Opposition, was not in point. The Court of