

tional case, and great injustice has been done in connection with it without any chance of revision by the Courts, except at very great expenses. Offences of this kind are committed in country towns as much as in cities.

MR. BLAKE: Of course the general question of how far it is proper to expose the subject to be penalised, at the discretion and judgment of a Justice of the Peace, is what the hon. Minister has to consider. I do not profess to be familiar with the extreme limit to which we have gone in former times, in allowing Justices of the Peace to sentence persons, but I am certain that the general run of extreme sentences allowed to Justices of the Peace are infinitely lower than the maximum given in this case. It is true that in Revenue cases a very high penalty is allowed, but there are obvious reasons why it is not likely that that will be abused when the Government is the prosecuting party; and what I venture to suggest to the hon. Minister is, to consider how far, if it be an innovation on our whole system to give such extensive primitive powers to a Justice of the Peace, it should go. I do not say that the sentences might not be quite right. I quite sympathise with the feeling which induces the hon. gentleman to propose a power to punish, much more severely than by imprisonment for thirty days, those who are guilty of the atrocious and deliberate acts of inhuman cruelty in the name of sport of which we sometimes hear. The question is, if we decide now to trust to the discretion of a Justice of the Peace, as to whether twelve months' imprisonment and \$100 fine shall be awarded to one class of crimes, how far we are not remodelling our whole system, and how far it may not be proper to give a general increase of power to the Justices of the Peace concerning many of these crimes which are deserving, sometimes, of a more severe sentence. We have, in Ontario, a tolerably rapid system of trying persons under the Summary Jurisdictions Act, and it seems to me that when the hon. gentleman proposes an increase so serious as this in the maximum quantity of punishment, it will be not improper for him to consider whether we should not alter the jurisdiction and provide for a higher class of magistrates.

MR. CAMERON.

MR. McDONALD: (Pictou) I think there is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and I will consider this matter before the Bill reaches its next stage.

Bill read the second time.

ONTARIO BOYS' REFORMATORY BILL.

[BILL No. 98.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I move the second reading of this Bill. It is confined to Ontario and provides for the confinement of boys under sixteen years of age, under certain circumstances, in the Reformatory provided by that Province. The principle of the Bill is, that although a boy may only be sentenced for one year, if, in the opinion of the Judge, it is for the moral and material welfare of the boy that he should be kept in the Reformatory for any longer period after the expiration of the sentence, the Judge may so extend his detention for as long a period as he deems proper, not exceeding five years. The Bill has been introduced at the suggestion of the Attorney-General for Ontario, who informed me that the circumstances of the country, and particularly of the institutions of that Province, rendered a provision of this kind necessary.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. CAMERON (South Huron): The Bill of the hon. the Minister of Justice is a good one as far as it goes. The difficulty about it is that its scope is not wide enough. The principle of the Bill is a good one, but the hon. gentleman has not carried it far enough to embrace just the class of the criminal population, that, above all others, should engage the earnest attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice, whose great object, when dealing with this kind of legislation, should be the prevention, as well as the punishment, of crime when committed. The Bill proposes to deal with that portion of the male criminal population under sixteen years of age, but, unfortunately, it only undertakes to deal with that small part of it which has passed the initial stages of moral depravity—fairly entered