

he would say that in the Legislature of Nova Scotia he had been opposed to that hon. gentleman for years, and there was not a man in the Province who enjoyed a higher reputation. Governor Archibald was a man of unstained political reputation, a man occupying the highest and most respectable position, not only as a public man, but in his private character. He was sent to the North West to administer the Government, not according to despotic rule or according to the view of the Government he had left behind him here, but according to the best of his judgment. When he went there he found the population rent in twain, and the result of his rule was that he was unanimously sustained by the people of the Province. Instead of violence and bloodshed peace and good order now reigned.

As to the reference that had been made to the Volunteers, instead of there being on the part of the people of Manitoba, a hue and cry to get rid of those volunteers, the statements of the representatives of that country and the record of several public meetings that had been held showed that the people were most anxious that the volunteers should remain. He thought that if the results were a fair test, Mr. Archibald's course, although mistakes might have occurred, ought to give unqualified satisfaction to the people of the Dominion. He would not have risen to his feet had he not felt that knowing Mr. Archibald, and knowing that he was entitled to the confidence of the House and of the country, and to the grateful thanks of the people, he would have done injustice to his feelings had he remained silent. Every one could see, however, that the motion was brought at a time, and with the avowed object of obstructing the Government and deranging the public business, and it was founded on statements that were not true. It was stated that Government had power to deal with the question. He need not remind the House of the terms of the Extradition Treaty which had already been so clearly explained. The crime Mr. Riel and other parties were charged with was the crime of murder, and murder connected with high treason, and the demand for extradition, if made at all, would have to have been made by Great Britain, because the crime occurred in a British Possession. Well, why did not Great Britain deal with the matter? Why, knowing her rights under the Extradition Treaty, she knew she would render herself an object of ridicule if she demanded the extradition of a criminal on the charge of high treason. No country could ask extradition on such a charge. Again, it had been asked why an amnesty was not given. Every one knew that the Government had no power to grant an amnesty, and that the Queen herself had no power to do so; it could alone be done by an Act of the Imperial Government. He thought he had shown that in this matter the Government had been assailed for not doing what neither Law nor Constitution enabled them to do, and also that Mr. Archibald had discharged his duty to the best of his ability, and with a single eye to the peace and the prosperity of the Province under his care, and in undertaking a task so difficult he was entitled to the favorable consideration of the House and the country.

Hon. Mr. WOOD joined issue with the Hon. Minister of Militia and others who declared that this Government had no jurisdiction over the North West at any time. An Imperial Statute passed in

1803 issued a commission appointing persons to take information, issue warrants, apprehend parties, and bring them to the Province of Lower Canada, or as issued directly under seal of Lower Canada to Upper Canada, and try them before the proper tribunals. Under this Act, two persons (Brown and Boucher) were arrested in the North West and tried at Little York. In 1818 the Hudson's Bay Co. entered into bonds with the Imperial Government, in the sum of £5,000 stg. to apprehend in their own territory themselves and hand over criminals for trial by the Government of Lower Canada under this Imperial Act. In the transfer of the North West to Canada, this power was transferred to the Governor General of the Dominion from the Governor General of Canada. (*Hear, Hear.*) Now, in the face of these facts all the fine arguments of the hon. members opposite were the most worthless balderdash. (*Order, order!*) It was absurd to say that while these acts remained in force (and they had never been repealed) that this Government had not authority to punish any crime committed in the North West. The President of the Council had stated that murder was not within the limit of the Extradition Act. Well, every one knew that political offences were not within the scope of the Act, but murder certainly was, and no Government would ever hesitate to deliver up a murderer. There was, however, a period of time when the Dominion Government had authority and jurisdiction over the North West. By Order in Council it was transferred to the Dominion of Canada, and along with it the obligation to preserve the peace and to punish crime, and at that time most unquestionably the Dominion Government had jurisdiction, and he would ask the President of the Council, who had jurisdiction, if the Dominion of Canada had not, from the date of the transfer to the time of the erection of the Province. It was perfectly plain that no one had ever had any jurisdiction but the Governor General and Government of Canada, and no one but that Government was responsible for the non-execution of the law. It might not have been politic to punish the crime, but certainly the power existed.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said he was surprised to hear such an argument from a legal gentleman. The hon. member had tried to shew that the Dominion Government had the right to exercise criminal jurisdiction in the Red River, and had quoted an Imperial Act of 1803 which enabled the Hudson's Bay Company to bring down criminals to Lower Canada, and to have them tried there. He remembered a case of a poor Indian having been brought down on a charge of murder and tried in the District of Three Rivers because it was alleged that if the boundary lines of that district were extended they would enclose the place at which the murder was committed. The man was found guilty and condemned to death, but a philanthropic Society in England took up his case and proved clearly that there was a mistake territorially, and succeeded in obtaining a pardon. The Act of 1803 cited was afterwards amended in 1815 or 1816, giving to Upper Canada the right to the same jurisdiction, to some extent. The Confederation Act, however, deprived the Dominion Government of the administration of justice in any Province, and the hon. member had quoted the 12th clause, but if he would read that clause and the 65th clause also, he would find that his whole