the other night; but when an hon. member charges me across the floor of the House, as I understand him to do, with wilfully misstating the law, I think it is due to myself, certainly due to the House, that I should answer a charge of that kind. Now, if I misstated the law, I have got the authority of the Consolidated Statutes for my misstatement; for in the Statutes consolidated under the Act prepared by the hon. member for West Durham, I find that the offence is triable before two magistrates, just as I said. But I am inclined to think, upon further investigation, that it is not a correct consolidation; nevertheless, it is the authority upon which I made the statement. The clause in the Consolidated Act is, that for these offences the party shall:

"On summary conviction before two justices of the peace, or on indictment, be liable to a penalty not exceeding $100, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labor."

That is the way it is consolidated. On looking back at the Act itself, I find that it refers to two other Statutes. It refers to an Act passed in 1872, to an amendment to that Statute passed in 1876. On reading these two Acts together —which I had not done, assuming that the consolidation was correct—I find that the earlier Act which permitted a trial before two magistrates, was repealed by a later Act, and gave the party the option or privilege of refusing to be tried before two magistrates. That was the change that was made. However, I think that statement is due to the hon. member for West Durham, but it does not at all affect my argument. My argument was this: That we in this Parliament permitted two magistrates to try and imprison without trial by jury. It was incorrect to say that the hon. member for West Durham was the author of this legislation; but in 1872, and from that to 1875, that was the law of this land—that two magistrates, for offences of violence, could try without a jury, without the party having an opportunity to elect to be tried by a jury, for offences similar to those which, by the so-called Coercion Act in England, are to be tried by two magistrates, the difference being in the length of the term of punishment. That statement, I think, I ought to make, and that is all I propose to say in answer to what has been said in reply to my remarks the other day. I do not at all propose to follow the different charges made against myself. The hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Clayes), spoke of me as being the leader of the Orange faction in the House, I think, and being an Orangeman, or something of that kind; the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) spoke of me as desiring to oppress minorities. What my opinions are in reference to those charges I do not suppose the House would care to listen to at this hour, but some other opportunity may be afforded for me to explain and to justify what I have said.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that his argument was not at all affected by the correction made by the hon. member for Bothwell, and in some sort restated by himself; but his argument was an *argumentum ad hominem*——

Mr. McCARTHY. I deny that.

Mr. BLAKE. Specially directed to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I deny that.

Mr. BLAKE. It was an indictment against me quite proper to be urged in respect to the impropriety of this Coercion Bill, inasmuch as I have been the author of a Coercion Bill in the Canadian Parliament. That was the position which the hon. gentleman took. To-night he has to admit that the Coercion Bill which, he says, did not affect his argument, was somebody else's act. It is quite true; it was the act of his leader. It was quite true that what the First Minister did in the laws with reference to certain acts of violence, provided that they should be tried before two justices. That was the state of things in 1872 under the Conservative Administration of that day. In the year 1876, when I was called upon to deal with the question, I altered that, and I caused to cease to exist the Canadian coercion law which the hon. gentleman——

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will excuse me for one moment. Will the hon. gentleman say what he did in 1875? I think he was then in the Administration.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not.

Mr. McCARTHY. At all events his party was, and the law of 1872 was amended in 1875.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know at this moment what was done in 1875, I was not in the Administration. I am now speaking of what I did. I say that in 1876 I altered the law thus:

"Where a person is brought before a functionary or tribunal named in the second section of the said Act of the 35th year of Her Majesty's reign, cap. 31, in respect to any offence under the provisions of the first section of the said Act as amended by the second section of this Act, the accused may on appearing before such functionary or tribunal declare that he objects to being tried for such offence by such functionary or tribunal, and thereupon such functionary or tribunal shall not proceed with such trial, but may deal with the case in all respects as if the accused were charged with an indictable offence and not with an offence punishable on summary conviction, and the accused may be prosecuted on indictment accordingly; and this section shall be read as part of the said Act."

So that I restored to those who were chargeable under the Act of 1872 their right, their absolute right to be tried by jury, leaving them the option of being tried summarily before two magistrates, if they did not object to that method of trial. Then in the Act of 1877 to which the hon. gentleman alluded, I made that provision under the Act in the form which I have just read—that the clause which I have just read should apply so that when that was made—I will not say it was made a part of the criminal law, for it was a part of the criminal law at that time—but when the new provision was made and that particular class remained under the criminal law, while the breach of contract was taken out of the category of criminal offences, I gave expressly to the subjects charged with the first named offences the right of trial by jury. So the argument *ad hominem* of the hon. gentleman was altogether wrong. I am very sorry that the application of the Revised and Consolidated Statutes should be productive of such painful results on this occasion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps I may be allowed to say, that while I applied my argument, as I did very distinctly, to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that was not the argument, but it was the application. The hon. gentleman has reiterated the statement in defiance of my denial. My statement was this: I said, were we the parties to be finding fault with Her Majesty's Government for passing a law of this kind when we passed the law to which I refer; and, I added, least of all did that come with good grace from the hon. member for West Durham. That was the way I put it.

Mr. GIGAULT. I know I am far from possessing the knowledge, the intelligence and eloquence of the right hon. leader of this House, and that many people will consider it as boldness on my part to rise to answer some of the assertions made by him in reply to what I said this afternoon. But however feebly I may do so, I will endeavor to defend my convictions as well as I am able. He said that I was wrong when I criticised the Act of Union, because it did not give to the inhabitants of Lower Canada fair representation. I did not attack the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on that account only. As illustrating the Tory proclivity of that hon. member, I quoted his speech at Barrie. I said also that he was the chief promoter of the Imperial Federation scheme, and these facts I produced as proof of his Tory proclivities. The right hon. leader says, and says rightly, that he defended