

be continued by the present or any succeeding Government, from the chance of being imposed upon, we have not forgotten the promise made by the Government that they would make the land in that country recoup to the Dominion the \$25,000,000 that we have promised the Syndicate, and what the Dominion has already spent, or is spending, on the Pacific Railway. There is no reason in the world, as I have urged again and again, why the people of the older Provinces should put their hands in their pockets and settle that country and improve it and build railways at their expense. That country, which is going to reap the advantage of those railways, should provide the cost of the improvements, and the North-West, I am happy to say, is so rich and will be so sought after, that what was a reasonable proposition at the beginning is now a certainty, namely, that it will be able to sell sufficient land that, while preserving the homesteading right, it would be able to repay to those who have contributed to the taxes necessary in connection with building the road, the money with interest added. My hon. friend speaks about the Civil Service Act, and he indulges in a little good-natured badinage about political patronage, and says he does not know whether the Government would pay sufficient attention to the representations of my hon. friend, the member for Beauharnois. All I can say is this: that we will pay at least as much attention to the representations of my hon. friend from Beauharnois as hon. gentlemen opposite did to those of the member for West Elgin. The hon. gentleman refers to the proposed legislation regarding fugitive offenders and the law under the Ashburton Treaty. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be well that that law should be extended—that the treaty should be extended, and that the number of offences under the treaty should be increased. I think now that there is such a similarity between the criminal law in the United States and Canada that every felony, and some of the crimes which are not technically called felonies, might well be subjects for surrender. If we can send back to Quebec a man who commits a crime in that Province, and escapes to Ontario because we have faith in their tribunals, we should have the same faith in the American tribunals and return their offenders across our borders, having every confidence that they will have as fair a trial as in our own country. I know that my hon. friend, and the Administration with which he was connected, attempted to deal with this subject. It is one which is not altogether, or in any considerable degree, within our power; it is only by action with the Mother Country and through the Mother Country that we can hope that a treaty may be made extending the terms of the Ashburton Treaty. The case which the hon. gentleman mentions, going on in Toronto, is certainly a strong instance of the imperfections of the treaty. Such a case arose when I was Minister of Justice, and, there being no *Habeas Corpus*, I tried the matter as on the original information, and the party was found guilty and returned to the gaol from which he feloniously escaped. The hon. gentleman, in referring to the trade which has been opened with Brazil, says that he would like to see all such commercial developments under the control of our own agents. If my memory serves me right, when we did appoint a quasi-diplomatic agent, one who was as nearly an ambassador as our colonial connection would permit, the hon. gentleman indulged in a good deal of the sarcasm, which he can use so powerfully and so successfully sometimes, upon the appointment of Sir Alexander Galt. I may say that in consequence of such arrangements made in England, Her Majesty's Government have agreed that in commercial treaties with any nations whatever, in which we may be interested, he shall be present as an assessor, and shall be put in immediate communication with those through whom the negotiations are going on. He has been so recognized both in Madrid and Paris, and though

political events have, as we all know, prevented the progress of the treaty with the Mother Country, so successful have been our attempts to have control of our own treaty-making, that Her Majesty's Government have agreed that if no commercial treaty shall be made between France and England, our representative may negotiate with France and make an arrangement on our behalf, so that Canada will be enabled to deal directly with other nations in matters affecting our trade and commerce. I shall not now allude to the question of disallowance. That is a serious question, involving questions of constitutional law, questions between the Dominion Government and Parliament and the Provincial Governments and Legislatures, and matters which, as the hon. gentleman knows, must be carefully handled and fully and dispassionately discussed. I hope that these questions will be approached by both sides of the House with an ardent desire to prevent constitutional difficulties or undue friction between the Provincial and Dominion Legislatures, or undue exercise of power by any of these bodies. My hon. friend is surprised at the breach of Parliamentary practice by the Minister of Finance in announcing to the public generally, in these democratic days, that there would be a reduction of the tea and coffee duties. My hon. friend, I think, has carried out the old parliamentary practice, and has observed that respect which a Minister of Finance ought to pay Parliament in making his announcements. If I remember aright, the hon. gentleman took occasion last Session to say that if there were no negotiations going on for a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, and if the state of the public chest would allow it, he would introduce a measure for the reduction or abolition of the duties on tea and coffee. There can be no mistake that he made such an announcement, and when he made the statement at the hustings or on the platform he was merely conveying to the public what he had previously, with due respect, conveyed to Parliament at his last Session. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is rather mixed in his recollection about the tea and coffee duties. I think he stated that we had increased those duties.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He said that we imposed them. The hon. gentleman must know that they were an old source of revenue, that they were increased by the Finance Minister in the Government of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), and that we reduced them.

Mr. BLAKE. There were no tea and coffee duties when my hon. friend was in office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And he imposed them, and now, under the favor of Providence and with the assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite, we propose to take them off. I have only one thing more to say, and that is, that I quite agree with the graceful and sympathetic terms in which my hon. friend spoke of the assassination of the President of the United States. It thrilled the heart of every man in Canada with horror to hear that, so causelessly, so sinfully, so wickedly, and so ferociously—from a mere desire for notoriety, or from some latent feeling of vindictiveness which we cannot fathom—so valuable and blameless and so worthy a life should have been shortened just as it promised to enter upon a new career of usefulness. I can only say, in conclusion, that I trust my hon. friend opposite and myself will conduct our discussions—the frailty of human kind intervening and interposing—in the same kindly spirit which I hope has actuated both of us in our remarks to-day.

On paragraph 26,

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say, in answer to the allusion of the hon. gentleman to another speech, that I knew no