

not allowed to produce evidence which was necessary for his exculpation. Lord COCHRANE asked the House to make an inquiry itself, declaring his readiness to produce such evidence as would beyond all question establish his entire innocence of the charge made against him. What was the answer of the Attorney General? Why, that the House was not a judicial tribunal for reviewing decisions of the Court of Queen's Bench; that if any improper act had been done by the court, the party should adopt the legal course and seek the proper remedy; that the remedy was not to be sought in the House of Commons; that the House was precluded from entering into the merits of the question by the judgment of the court itself. Now, this House was in precisely this position: they had nothing to do with the regularity or irregularity of the proceedings against RIEL. They knew that he had been accused of murder, that he was a fugitive from justice, and because he was such they expelled him. The House was not called upon to review the judgment of the court, but simply, in consequence of that judgment, to take the necessary proceedings for the election of another member in the place of RIEL, whose seat in consequence of that judgment whether it was valid or invalid was vacant,—and until it was set aside it must be assumed to be valid by the House. The House should not be misled by the arguments of the hon. member for Cardwell and the hon. member for Kingston, which might be very proper and pertinent if addressed to a court reviewing the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba, but which were entirely out of place, under the circumstances in this House.

Mr. MASSON said that he and those on that side of the House with whom he worked and with whom he fought the question of amnesty up to that time were comparatively indifferent to the present discussion. It had been decided against everything they had said and done that they had lost the battle, and that RIEL must be expelled the House. The only difficulty now was to find the proper way of turning him out. The majority of the House had decided, upon the advice of the Government, that the settlement which they had offered the House was a final settlement, and that

RIEL should be banished from this country for five years. The House had decided, consistently, on the advice of the Prime Minister, that RIEL should be banished, in order to mark the enormity of the crime, and now they should be asked, on the strength of the evidence before them, to vote for the expulsion of RIEL, irrespective of any legal proceedings that might have been taken. A more manly course to have pursued would have been to declare that RIEL, being guilty of a crime which necessitated his banishment from the country, he had no right to sit in this House. He had told hon. members when the question was previously before the House that in voting for the resolutions of the Government they voted that RIEL should be expelled from the House, and his prediction was that day verified. The Government did not go to the logical conclusion of their position, but they told their friends, "You are not voting for the expulsion of RIEL because he deserves to be expelled, but because he has been outlawed." The Minister of Justice had told the House that the reasons which induced them to expel RIEL last year were stronger now; that last year there may have been a doubt; that the Minister of Public Works was wrong perhaps last year in voting for the expulsion of RIEL, but this year he would be right in doing so because RIEL was outlawed. Why was RIEL an outlaw? RIEL was an outlaw because all along he (RIEL) and the people of Lower Canada had been led to understand that the whole of RIEL's case rested on the point, whether an amnesty had or had not been promised him. RIEL had been led to believe, as he (Mr. MASSON), and all those who had taken an interest in the subject had been led to believe, that an amnesty would soon be granted. At the time of the last elections it was proclaimed through Lower Canada that now that this Government had taken the place of the Government of the member for Kingston the amnesty would be sure to come.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON—The hon. member for Kingston denies that the amnesty was promised.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—I said the amnesty was sure to come.

Mr. MASSON—A few months before the meeting of Parliament last session they were told that if an amnesty had been promised, it would be granted and