

Mr. GIROUARD. I hear an hon. gentleman say "hear, hear." I think he deserves to be afflicted with a six hours' speech, but I have too much consideration for the rest of the House, though I may not have much for him, to indulge in a speech of that length. I am not going to trouble the House with reading the report of the medical men, Dr. Lavell, Dr. Valade and Dr. Jukes. In my mind their conclusions are that this man was insane. Drs. Lavell and Valade said he was suffering from monomania on religion and politics. Does it require long comment to show there was connection between the rebellion and the monomania on politics and religion. I look upon another portion of the conclusion of these gentlemen as mere sophistry, namely, that with the exception of these two points, monomania on religion and politics, this man knew the difference between right and wrong. It is not within the province of medical men to testify to that fact. Their province is only to state the nature of the disease under which the man was suffering, and let the jurors, court or Government draw from that statement whether the prisoner knew the difference between right and wrong. Dr. Haslam, on that point, says:

"It is not the province of the medical witness to pronounce an opinion as to the prisoner's capability of distinguishing right from wrong. It is the duty of the medical man, when called upon to give evidence in a court of law, to state whether he considers insanity to be present in any given case, not to ascertain the quantity of reason the person imputed to be insane, may or may not possess. \* \* \* It is sufficient," continues Dr. Haslam, "for the medical practitioner to know that the person's mind is deranged, and that such a state of insanity will be sufficient to account for the irregularity of his actions."

I will conclude these remarks, in order to give more time to other hon. gentlemen who wish to explain their position. I heard, the other day, the Minister of the Interior say that it was a matter of very little importance whether petitions were sent from the country or not to the Government, on the question of the proper exercise of the prerogative of mercy. I was never so much surprised as to hear that the Government are not in duty bound to consider such petitions. In most cases they are the only mode that can be adopted to show the Government what public feeling is on a particular case, in order to induce the Government to exercise the prerogative of mercy. Was the public feeling which prevailed throughout the whole Dominion with regard to the fate of this unfortunate man in favor of his execution? It was thought at one time that strong influence was brought from an influential body of men asking for Riel's blood. When the papers were brought down, we found only three petitions from the whole Dominion calling for his execution: one from the Orangemen of the