

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the rent is not now paid according to the power of the respective mills. The leases contain a great many conditions, which I do not now remember; but I think the rent is so much for each lot, with a restriction as to the power to be used.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the face amount of the claims originally?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We did not throw off any substantial amount. The claims were paid in full. The principal difficulty was in getting a settlement of new conditions.

Mr. MULOCK. Has that agreement been rescinded?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, it has not. It applies still, I presume, to the small amounts collected. I am referring now to the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be prudent to put an end to the agreement, so that in future if such services are required, the agreement will be made applicable to the particular transaction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There never can be again for many years, at any rate, so large an amount as this put in their hands for collection.

Militia expenses in connection with the rebellion in the N.W. Territories..	\$8,017
Pension—J. Franckum, late Gunner "A" Battery, pension from 19th July, 1890, to 30th June, 1891, at 30 cents per diem.....	104.10

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is for militia pensions on active service. Franckum was discharged from "A" Battery on pension the 19th of July, 1890, at 30 cents per diem. The Order in Council was passed the 27th June, 1890. Franckum entered in July, 1881. By a rifle bullet striking him above the ear, while marking at the rifle butts for his battery, he became injured. He had to pass the medical board and was so severely wounded that he became insane and is in a lunatic asylum. All the papers were submitted to the Department of Justice, and the whole matter submitted to Council before the Order in Council was passed. There is an amount for legal expenses, \$350; for transport, \$1,450; for clerical work re North-West claims, \$500; North-West Navigation Company, judgment of the Exchequer Court, \$5,400.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Government to pay the claim made by Mr. Bremner in connection with North-West rebellion matters?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is only a week since that came in, and it has not yet been examined.

Seed grain and expenses collecting and receiving grain	\$2,338.71
--	------------

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year \$3,150 were voted in the Supplementary Estimates for seed grain. Out of that, at the end of the financial year, there was \$666 of the appropriation lapsed, as the accounts were not all in within the three months which we were allowed to pay the accounts which had been incurred at the end of the financial year. Therefore, all the addition we ask on account of those accounts is \$600. We expect to have \$1,000 more to pay for the expense of receiving the seed grain which is now being paid back. We have to pay a small percentage to some parties for collecting, and as

the grain is sold and paid for the money is paid in to the Receiver General.

Mr. MULOCK. When did the distribution of grain take place?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A year ago last spring. None has been distributed since and none is asked for this year.

Mr. WATSON. How much has been paid back?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have a rough memo. of the account for seed grain advanced in 1888-89 and 1889-90, showing \$81,882, and the amount refunded has been \$45,435.

To pay ex-constable G. H. Harpur balance of pension to 30th June, 1891, on account of Rebellion of 1885	\$814.60
---	----------

Mr. DEWDNEY. Harpur's first application for pension was made by letter from him dated Battleford, 21st April, 1890, and inquiries were continuous into the case until the matter was taken up by the late Premier on the 15th November, 1890, when application was made in Parliament. Harpur stated that his expenses for medicines and medical advice had far exceeded those for the necessaries of life; that he had been unable to perform any ordinary bodily labour since 1885, and that to support himself and pay his doctors' bills, he had been compelled to sell all his personal property; that he had been frequently urged to apply for a pension but put it off in the hope of ultimate recovery, and, having expended all he possessed in supporting himself, he was compelled to ask for assistance.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite satisfied with that. I was only anxious to find out if the department had had this case before it for years without taking action.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 3rd July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays for the remainder of the Session, and that the order of business for Wednesday under Rule 19 be made the Order for Mondays.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would consent that this rule should not apply to next Wednesday, but that next Wednesday should remain members' day. I have no objection to the motion taking effect next Wednesday week.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We thought that it would be sufficient to take the Orders for next Wednesday on Monday next, because the number of measures in the hands of private members is very small, and the hon. gentleman will see himself that it will be necessary to expedite the business of the

House. Perhaps if members have the afternoon of next Wednesday, the Government could take the evening.

Mr. LAURIER. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the paper is not much loaded with business in the hands of private members, but still there is a good deal to be yet disposed of. There is, for instance, Mr. Cameron's Bill to amend the Criminal Law, which is an important measure, and it may take some hours' discussion. I think it would be better if next Wednesday should be allowed to remain as members' day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I am sure that he and his friends will make up for that on other days and help us to get through the business.

Mr. LAURIER. We have no desire to remain here in this hot weather longer than we can help it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may mention in connection with the Bill referred to by the hon. gentleman, that I propose to ask, after any discussion that may be thought necessary upon it, that it shall stand over for circulation with the Criminal Code which has been drafted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Code has not been brought down yet.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has been brought down, but it has not been distributed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

House again resolved into Committee on Bill (No. 13) to provide for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will state, at the outset, what I intend to suggest with regard to all the clauses that were allowed to stand. I propose that the appeal to the Exchequer Court from a Vice-Admiralty judge shall be optional with that to the Supreme Court. I propose that the tenure of office shall be during good behaviour, like that of other judges. I propose to abolish all fees payable to the Vice-Admiralty judges, and to make provision for the appointment of deputy judges, to take the place of judges who are interested or unable to sit, and surrogate judges with subordinate jurisdiction, and with such authority as may be conferred upon them by the general rules which may be made in pursuance of this Act. The object of having surrogate judges is to facilitate procedure in cases instituted at a distance from the place of registry. These are the principal amendments.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This was allowed to stand, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had some doubt as to whether it did not curtail the jurisdiction given by the other clauses. I think it merely provides the places where the court may exercise its jurisdiction, and does not restrict the powers of the court.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I would suggest whether it would not be better to do for admiralty jurisdiction what has been done with regard to contro-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

verted election cases, and allow the admiralty cases to be dealt with by the ordinary courts of each province.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman was not here the other day when that question was raised by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and I endeavoured to reply by stating that that view had been very fully considered, and that while I had to admit it had many advantages, such as the consolidation of all the litigation in one tribunal, there were other decided advantages in favour of pursuing the course of keeping this court under federal authority. One was that the power to legislate on this subject was lately given to us, and it may be very useful to have the organization we are making by this Bill available for other purposes than mere admiralty jurisdiction; and, besides, we avoid, by retaining the present officers, providing pensions for some twenty officers, whom the Imperial Parliament have legislated in favour of, in the way of pensions, if we dispensed with their services.

Sections 20, 21 and 25 struck out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In moving that the Committee rise and report the Bill, I may say that the resolutions to provide for the salaries which will be necessary in consequence of the abolition of the fees, will be moved separately, and that a separate Bill will be introduced to provide for them so as not to interfere with the progress of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that the Committee should simply report progress, and that the Minister should have the Bill reprinted, so that we may see how it stands and whether any error exists before it is passed. No time will be lost by that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Bill is reported I will agree to have it reprinted before the third reading.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

High Commissioner's office. \$1,000

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate for contingencies last year amounted to \$6,789.22. There have been over-expenditures, and additional will be required in order to complete the year, of about \$1,000. There have been expended up to the 10th of June, on rent of offices and fuel, out of an estimate of \$2,800, \$2,100; cleaning and gas repairs, there was an estimate of \$250, and there were expended \$343; the expenditure, therefore, has overrun on that amount. Printing and stationery, the estimate was \$650; the expenditure was \$852, that item having overrun by about \$200. Postal expenses were \$33 over the estimate. In travelling expenses there was a decrease, the expenses being \$68 out of an estimate of \$200.

Mr. MULOCK. You are not charging for the trip out to Canada the other day?

Mr. FOSTER. No, that would not bring him out. There is an increase in the income tax. The messenger's estimate was \$700; the amount expended up to the 10th of June was \$516. Extra clerk in place of one who has retired, \$73. So that altogether, taking into account these over-expenditures up to the 10th of June, \$1,000 will be required to meet the expenditure up to the last of the year.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not take it out of that \$2,000?

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot do that this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no desire to detain the Committee at any length on this item, but I want to say this. The items for contingencies in connection with the High Commissioner's office in London are very minutely detailed in the Auditor General's Report, but I cannot see unless from the remarks the Finance Minister just made, that there is any necessity for granting an additional sum of \$1,000. Now, there were some remarks made with regard to the contents of the High Commissioner's report, which was pretty well criticized at a previous stage of this session. As I said then, I cannot see that there is a necessity for all the expenditure in connection with that office that we are called upon to bear each year; and, in my humble opinion, there ought to be a very carefully and minutely prepared statement of all these expenditures, so that we might fully understand how every item of this money has been spent. I notice that it is increasing every year. It is to be regretted that year after year the cost of that office is rising. You go back five years and you will find it was very much less than it is now. It was less under Sir A. T. Galt than it is under Sir Charles Tupper. I do not for a moment doubt that, perhaps, he performs duties and does a considerable amount of travelling and so on. The duties of the office may be increasing, but I say in justice to the people of this country who are tax-payers, and in justice to this House, we should have a pretty detailed statement of all the moneys expended within and under the office of High Commissioner in London. In the first place I would like to know whether there has been an increase in the number of officers employed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there has been a decrease of one.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad, that is a step in the right direction; because, from the report we have received, I do not think there can be a necessity for the extensive staff that is kept there.

Mr. FOSTER. They are all kept at work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Judging from the report that has been sent in, it seems to be more in the line of an emigration office. While we have emigration agents in Liverpool and in other towns of the United Kingdom, whose duty it is to attend to that particular matter, I cannot see that a large amount of emigration business can devolve upon the High Commissioner and his staff in London, because those emigration agents must perform a very large part of that service. I want to get some idea as to when we may be able to reach the ultimate limit of the increased expenditure under the head of the High Commissioner. In order that we may ascertain that limit, we should have a very minutely detailed account laid before Parliament

so that we can form some idea as to whether this money is being well expended or not. There are increases in a great many lines, and it is our duty, as an Opposition, to oppose unnecessary increases, and closely to criticize them in the public interest. If we find, upon careful investigation, that they are justifiable, then we should consent to them; but if they are not justifiable, it is our duty to resist any further increase. In my opinion, the High Commissioner has been rather disposed to spend more money than was necessary in the general interests of this Dominion, and I would suggest that every detail of his expenditure should be closely criticized.

Printing voters' lists and election expenses

—Governor General's warrant..... \$21,500

Mr. FOSTER. These are the Governor General's warrants about which we were talking the other day, and none of us knew much. The details of the printing of the voters' lists, as given to me, are these: There was a Governor General's warrant taken, and the expenditure to 10th July was for the items which I will read: Pay of printers—that, of course, is the cost of the printers engaged upon the printing of the voters' lists, \$1,922; pay of clerks, \$2,000; Dominion Type Founding Company for type, and another company for type, \$1,500; express company, \$1.10; telegraph company, \$10; another telegraph company, \$24; Queen's Printer for printing stationery, \$331. Then there was an item advanced to the two revising officers by the Auditor General, to enable them to get to work upon the duties of their office, which is simply, of course, an advance of so much upon their salaries, which is sometimes done. The whole amount of the expenditure was \$6,702. Then there was a question raised as to the returns for the sale of the lists. The amount received for sale of voters' lists is \$3,907, making an expenditure over and above income of \$2,795. Now as to the details of elections—that is, the other returns. Out of \$11,500 there have been expended \$9,381. These expenditures have been for expressage. I may say that up to the past election there was an arrangement between the Dominion and the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, by which they had a joint ownership of the ballot boxes, and in the provinces there is a rather close connection between the municipalities and the Government, and for municipal elections, which are conducted by ballot, the same ballot boxes were used. So whenever an election came round the officers had to send men all over the country to scour up these ballot boxes, and this was attended with much difficulty and expense. An arrangement has been carried out with the Province of Quebec, by which that province bought the old boxes jointly owned by the province and the Dominion, and paid for them, and we got new ballot boxes in Quebec for ourselves, which are to be our very own and not to be trotted around and loaned, so that we will know where they are when we want them. A similar arrangement has not yet been completed in Ontario, but negotiations are being carried on. At all events, with regard to Ontario we adopted the same plan and got our own ballot boxes. The item for ballot boxes amounts to \$6,000, the cost of each box ranging from \$2 to \$2.50. They are considered to be very good boxes. The item, Queen's Printer, \$1,314, is explained in this way:

Heretofore in elections the instructions to voters and instructions to returning officers and that class of work were printed locally. This work has been done by the Queen's Printer, and consequently it appears here in a lump sum, instead of coming into the returning officers' expenses to be paid afterwards as part of the expenses of the elections. There are items here also for the expressage of the ballot boxes to their various destinations, and there is an item for clerical work, the largest portion of which is paid for the preparation of the return to be presented to the House of the results of the election in the different constituencies. These items make up a total of \$9,381, as follows:—Express charges \$199, clerical work \$966, ballot boxes \$6,600, printing and stationery \$1,380, travelling expenses \$100, telegraphing \$70.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the ballot boxes, it is a pity that the Government did not adopt more care in the construction of those boxes. In my constituency each ballot box is made with a lock, and the key is tied to the handle. When the deputy returning officer has performed his duty, he locks the box and leaves the key attached to the handle. Thus the locking of the box is a fallacy. The Government should have taken some means of obtaining boxes that were self-locking, and the boxes should have been given by the returning officer to the deputy officer, closed, but unlocked. When the deputy returning officer had performed the necessary inspection in the morning before the poll was opened he could close the lock with a spring, and there should not be a key attached to the handle. The hon. member for Grey had a very narrow escape owing to these keys being attached to the boxes, because the premises were opened and the keys being there the ballot boxes were unlocked and ballots were changed and others substituted.

Mr. FOSTER. Who would count the ballots at the close of the poll?

Mr. McMULLEN. There would be trouble on that point; but the ingenuity of the Government engineers would be able to devise some means of overcoming the difficulty. With respect to the printing of the lists, can the Minister of Finance say what rate is now paid to printers at the Printing Bureau. A few years ago the pay was \$10 a week, and it was raised to \$11, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. The same pay now prevails. Is it not a fact that a seal is attached to each ballot box?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt very much that a seal is attached, although the law may provide for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Something of the kind was done to the ballot boxes in the division in which I voted. I remained there till the close of the poll.

Mr. FRASER. It is not sufficient security unless the returning officer is thoroughly honest. There is security if there is only one key to the box, and it is given to the presiding officer, and that key at the close of the poll is placed in an envelope secured and initialled by the agent of both parties, and afterwards given to the returning officer and opened in the presence of the parties.

Mr. McMULLEN. The reason I asked with respect to the rate of wages paid to the printers is, that it was understood the pay should be \$11 per

Mr. FOSTER.

week, but on speaking to a printer whom I know he told me the rate is \$14 per week.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the hon. gentleman my own impression. I have not charge of that department, but I do not think any change has been made. However, I will enquire and give the hon. gentleman the information.

Intercolonial Railway.....\$300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We desire to have very full explanations from the Minister as to the causes of this enormous sum demanded on behalf of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. This sum of \$300,000 required for the Intercolonial Railway: \$4,000 for the Windsor Branch, and \$30,000 for the Prince Edward Island Railway, is to make up a deficiency in the running expenses of the road during the present year over the appropriation which was made during the last session of Parliament. The estimates as originally presented by the department included these sums of \$300,000, \$4,000 and \$30,000, but by some means they were omitted from the Estimates when they came before Parliament. These sums are to provide for the amount that was really asked for by those who were managing the department last year. The same sum is asked this year, namely \$3,700,000. It is made up of items for locomotive power, car expenses, maintenance of way and work, station and train expenses and general charges, making as near as they can approximate it \$3,700,000. It is only a repetition for me to say, that had not the Estimates been changed last year by some error, this deficiency would not now have to be asked for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course the hon. Minister of Customs was not Minister of Railways at the time, but I am afraid that the reason for leaving out that sum, after it had been applied for, was because there was a great reluctance to disclose to the House or to the country the enormous extent of the expected deficit on the Intercolonial Railway; more especially as a good deal of attention had been called to the fact that by reason of certain changes, and by reason of the construction of a line across the State of Maine, we were likely to add enormously to the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway. The statement now made by the hon. Minister would appear therefore, without, I think, any unfair straining of the facts, simply to imply this: That last year the Government, or the party in charge, thought it expedient not to take the House into their confidence as to the amount which was likely to be charged, and the amount of the deficit which was likely to be incurred. Now, I would like to know from the Minister if he can inform us, what at the present time is the charge for conveying coal on the Intercolonial Railway per ton per mile; say from Spring Hill mines, for example?

Mr. BOWELL. Three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Three-tenths of a cent is about half a farthing or a little more. On the English lines, if I am correctly informed, the charge for conveying coal is five-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, and if my memory does not altogether mislead me, it was stated last night by the Minister of Customs in reply to a question from

me, that five-tenths of a cent is the lowest rate at which heavy goods can be conveyed on the Intercolonial Railway. The consequence is, and the House, which is now asked to vote \$300,000 additional for the Intercolonial Railway, may make a note of it, that according to the statement given us last night, and according to the statement given us to-day, whereas it costs five-tenths of a cent per ton per mile to convey such goods, the country is conveying this coal for three-tenths of a cent or about one-half; or, in other words, on every single ton of coal which is hauled we sustain a loss of about one-fifth of a cent per ton per mile. I do not think, Sir, if that is a specimen of the way in which a good many of these charges are regulated, it is at all a matter to be wondered at, that there is now a deficit of over half a million dollars per year on the working of the Intercolonial Railway. So long as this system goes on, so long the whole of the country is going to be taxed for the purposes of conveying coal to oblige the proprietors of a particular railroad.

Mr. FRASER. I think there are other reasons why there is a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, and I can very well understand why it is necessary that this \$300,000 was not included in the Estimates, and has to be voted now. I was very much pleased with the speech made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) a few days ago when he referred to the Intercolonial Railway. It is becoming a very serious matter, and while I can conceive that the country is very much benefited by a Government railway carrying goods at a cheaper rate, still if we can find other reasons than that why a deficit occurs I think we should enquire into them. Now, Sir, I think that all thoughtful men ought to move in the direction indicated by the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and for this reason: I take it that the Intercolonial Railway is badly managed perforce. I think perhaps that even a stronger Government, a Government of stronger moral back-bone than the present Government, would make a mistake in running that road because there are so many people who look upon that Government road as something made for themselves and their friends, that the Government put anybody and everybody into office upon that road. During the last election we had a very fine example of the system under which the Intercolonial Railway is run. In every town there was a book of passes ready to be filled up with the names of voters, and these names were filled in and given to every man who wanted to go anywhere over the province to vote. I will give you one example of this, as I happen to have the evidence of it right in my hand. For example, the secretary of the Conservative Association for the County of Pictou is an official of the Dominion Government, he is keeper of the Savings Bank in the town of New Glasgow, and a very worthy man, and he was secretary of the Association in New Glasgow. A letter is addressed to a gentleman in New Glasgow, and is sent with the inscription "please have this delivered at once," and the name of Mr. Cameron, secretary of the Conservatives for the County, is put upon it to deliver it to the voter, and he does deliver it. The voter who lived in New Glasgow, but who had a vote in the County of Halifax, opens the letter and he finds that it contains two passes. The man has no idea of voting, but his name is found on the

list in Halifax, and it is discovered that he lives in the town of New Glasgow, and so adroitly is the work done that he gets a pass as an employé of the railway department. The pass reads as follows:—

"Intercolonial Railway—For employés only."

Of course, every man that votes is an employé of the Government, and this pass is for employés only—

"Pass—A B—From New Glasgow to Dartmouth."

I do not give his name, but I substitute the letters A B for it. He did not live in Dartmouth, nor did he need to go to Dartmouth at all, but so adroitly is the business managed, that in order to put the people off the scent, he is given a pass to Dartmouth. The pass says:

"Why granted"—

And there is a stroke after the words "why granted," because it could not be granted to him as an employé. The pass is good up to 5th March, and it is signed by D. Pottinger and was countersigned by P. S. Archibald. The pass was just handed to the man and he could go on that to Halifax to vote, but he did not go and did not vote. There was a return pass for this man, and the return pass is of a like character. It says:

"Pass—A B—From Halifax to Barney's River."

Barney's River is 20 miles beyond New Glasgow, where the man lives; they make it appear that he did not live in New Glasgow, and so they give him a pass to Barney's River, 20 miles beyond that, in order to bring him back from Halifax. I make the statement here, and I take the responsibility of the statement, that, if the books of the Intercolonial Railway are searched, during the time of the last election, it will be found that hundreds of voters were granted passes in the same way. Now, that is not fair to the other voters. If the Intercolonial Railway is to be used for election purposes, they should give passes all round. Why should unsanctified Grits be compelled to pay, when they go to vote, while these loyal Conservatives can get passes anywhere they like along the Intercolonial Railway? You will notice, of course, that the passes do not come from Ottawa at all; it is all done down below. The acting Minister of Railways knew nothing about it, or else he would frown upon it, and the chief engineer—whom I am glad to see on the floor of the House, instructing the Minister, and who conducts so well the business of the Intercolonial Railway—would not do it, of course; everyone knows that. You see, it is done at Moncton, and these books of passes were in the hands of the agents of the Conservative party; the book was handed to the Conservative agent, and he could fill it up with any name he liked. The Government found it was necessary to use so many more engines, and so much more coal, and to keep so many more men at work, that they, of course, found the money voted last year was not sufficient, and that is one of the reasons why this \$300,000 had to be drawn on a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. FOSTER. To carry your hundred voters.

Mr. FRASER. I submit that it is high time the Government should take this matter into their serious consideration. I tell you, that the fact that the people know that a Government road—and the Government are the trustees for the people—is

used for political purposes to carry men to vote from one end of the province to the other. is doing much to sap the public morality. It is bad enough when a railway company does this, for to a certain extent they are paying it out of their own pockets, but when the people's money is expended in this way at the rate of half a million dollars a year, to meet that deficit caused by carrying voters belonging to one particular party, I submit that it is high time that this matter should be enquired into. Now, I have got the papers here, and I can give the Government the names to show how these agents go behind their backs in this matter. I am not holding the Government altogether responsible. No man would ever think that the present Minister of Railways, or the late Minister of Railways, would be guilty of authorizing the granting of these passes. I only mention the fact to show that there must be looseness somewhere when the employés on the road could use their powers to pass voters from one part of Nova Scotia to another. There is a clamant need that the road should be run by men who cannot be influenced by pressure from persons who come to them and say: "This man or that man has a vote and should get a pass," or "Put my son on the railway," or "Give me a pass over the road because I am going to vote." Those who issued those passes are far worse than the men who took the passes; but so anxious were the Government to make the deficit larger that they sought the voters out and granted them passes. This occurred in Halifax, and I know that the hon. gentlemen who represent that county will repudiate it. I only mention this to show how, behind the backs of the Government, those men in some way or other hoodwink the authorities and abuse their powers. I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and all hon. members from Nova Scotia and elsewhere whose fame has been tarnished by these villainous officials, to unite together and see that these things do not happen again. The deficit on the Intercolonial Railway is becoming a very serious matter indeed, and I do trust that before the next session of Parliament something in the direction indicated by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) will be done. After the way the railway has been run, I admit that it would be very hard for the opponents of the Government, if they came into power, to stop these practices. It is very difficult for a Government in running a railway to resist this pressure; but they should draw the line somewhere; and in winter especially, when everybody knows that the expenses are greater than in summer, they should not allow the road to be used for carrying voters free. I have heard a good deal since I have been a member of this House about the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway carrying voters. It is a bad thing to find any railway company doing that; but I maintain that it is far worse when the Government enters the lists and uses a public railway for election purposes. I care not whether it is one party or the other that does it, it is demoralizing. That is one of the reasons why it is necessary to vote this \$300,000. If the Minister means that this amount was voted last year—

Mr. BOWELL. No. What I stated was that the officials in the department had asked for a sum
Mr. FRASER.

sufficient to cover this, but that in the House the amount was reduced for some reason or other.

Mr. FRASER. No reduction could be made except by the Government. That strengthens my argument and shows conclusively that it was the operation of the road during the election that made this vote necessary. I trust, however, that the serious attention of the Government will be given to this matter, and that no passes will be granted in future.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be, either on this item or on the main Estimates, an extended discussion on the management of the Intercolonial Railway. I know that personally, because a number of gentlemen on this side of the House have spoken to me about it, and some of them have asked me just now whether they should take this discussion at the present time or defer it until the main Estimates are under consideration. I should much prefer that the discussion should go over to the main Estimates, and that the present discussion should be confined to the item before us; but if the House thinks otherwise, we can have the discussion now. I should like to ask the opinion of the hon. member for South Oxford on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid that there is no alternative unless this item stands. To postpone the discussion until the main Estimates are before us may mean no discussion at all. It is quite possible, looking at the state of the House, that the vote might not be reached until a late period, and the statement made by my hon. friend, and some of the other statements, do undoubtedly require to be discussed and explained. If it is convenient for the hon. gentleman to withdraw the item, I am quite agreeable to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that that would be convenient.

Mr. MULLOCK. If the item stands, perhaps the Minister would make enquiry as to the number of passes which were issued during the election, so that we may discuss the question with a full knowledge of the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. It will not be possible for this vote to go over for any great length of time, as it is for the service of the year now up, and the amounts are pressing for payment. However, if it will facilitate matters, I will promise that very early in the consideration of the main Estimates the item of the Intercolonial Railway will be brought up, and the utmost freedom of discussion will be given upon it, and all information that can be brought will be brought. There is no wish on the part of the Government to avoid a thorough discussion of the Intercolonial Railway. In fact, I should welcome it myself as an individual member of the House; and I should like to have, so far as I am concerned, not the partisan, but the cool and well-thought-out opinions of members on both sides, in relation to the management of that railway. It is for no purpose of burking discussion that I make this suggestion; but the hon. gentlemen know how we are situated. Our desire is to have sufficient voted to provide for the working expenses of the railway. Under these circumstances, I am willing to promise that there will be full opportunity for discussion.

Mr. BOWELL. The amount that has been credited to the management of the Intercolonial

Railway has been exhausted, and it was only through the courtesy of the bank that the last pay rolls were met. Pay rolls for the past month are now unpaid, and unless the bank extends its favour still further, the employés of the road will have to wait. For that reason it is absolutely necessary, in order that the men on the road should be paid at the end of the month, that we should have this money placed at our disposal. I quite concur in the remarks made by the Finance Minister. There will be no attempt whatever to shirk any debate. We shall have the fullest and most extended investigation into the charges that may be made against the management of the road. I may say to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that I have no knowledge, personal or otherwise, of the charges he has made. I will say, however, that in the short time during which I have had connection with the road I have come to about the same conclusion as himself, that the people of the country think that the road is theirs, and that they have a right to use it. But in justice to the chief engineer, who directs the management of the road, I will say that if there has been any abuse of the pass privilege, it has not been on his part.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. Minister of Finance desires that when this item comes up again it shall receive full business-like discussion. That will involve information regarding the working of the road, which will enable us to discover how it is money has been lost, and, if possible, provide a remedy. The information, therefore, I have asked for will be very necessary. Are passengers being carried for less than a fair rate or for nothing? And if so, to what extent? Then, if the schedules of rates are not always adhered to, we should have information as to the exceptions made. Further, we should know to what extent the pass system has been adopted, not merely in connection with elections, but generally. I have been told that it is an ordinary occurrence to see a passenger train of dead-heads pass through as railway employés. People consider it is their own railway, and that they have the right to travel on it free. If there are any books to show that, we should have the information. I would like the acting Minister of Railways to say also whether passengers are allowed to travel over that road without any pass at all, and whether a custom does not prevail of carrying people free by car loads at election times without even having passes. We also should have a statement as to whether the road is used for political purposes or a party character such as have been referred to by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the hon. Minister of Finance has made the suggestion, and as I think it extremely likely that this discussion, once entered into, may go to very considerable lengths, I would suggest to my hon. friends that they should, provided the Minister of Customs sees his way to accept the suggestion, supply him with statements of such information as will be required, and we will agree to forego at present the general discussion, on the understanding that this will be the first item brought up after the Budget debate is disposed of.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. member for Guysborough will put in writing what he has stated, and

if the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) will put in writing what he wants, I will endeavour to obtain all the information I can get on these points. But I can assure these hon. gentlemen that passengers are not permitted to pass up and down the road free, unless the conductors violate their instructions and defraud the revenue.

Mr. FRASER. I am bound to say in corroboration of what the hon. Minister has stated, that at any other time there is the greatest possible strictness with regard to the general public, who must show their tickets or passes every time, or pay their money.

Mr. LANGELIER. From my own personal knowledge I know that on the day when a certain public meeting at Rimouski, during the last election, was to be held, there were two special excursion trains bringing the people to the meeting, the one from the east and the other from the west, and I saw the system which was resorted to in order to allow the Tory voters to get to that meeting without paying.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we to abide by the understanding suggested or go into a discussion now? If these charges are made, they must be met.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order that the Government should have the necessary information when the matter comes up, it is highly desirable that we should provide them with it now.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not highly desirable that all sorts of charges should be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, involving the good name of the railway, and that those charges should go to the public in the *Hansard* without any reply being made to them. The Minister of Railways made a fair proposition. Whatever information any hon. gentleman on the other side wishes to have let him send the Minister a note of it, and he will furnish the information as far as possible. I do not think it is fair that charges should go upon the record without any rebuttal appearing, as there are many people who will simply read the charges and not follow the sequence in a fortnight or three weeks later.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Minister of Customs said that the practice mentioned did not take place, or that if it did, it was in violation of the rules of the department. My hon. friend from Quebec wishes to give the hon. Minister the information in advance of violations of that rule to his knowledge.

Mr. McMULLEN. All we desire is to place the Government in possession of the information which they must have before them when this question comes up for discussion. We do not want them to be in a position to say that we did not intimate our intention of putting these questions. We want to know, when this road is not paying working expenses, whether we are running any cars at the entire cost of the Dominion, as we have reason to believe is the case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand that the observations addressed to the Committee by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) were, in any way, a departure from the understanding which was had. If that hon. gentleman is able to inform the acting Minister of Railways of certain facts that came within his own observation, the Minister of Railways might very well explain them now, if he can, or if he cannot now, he may explain them when we come to dis-

cuss the general Estimates. In fact, it gives the Government the opportunity of knowing what the complaint is and what the defence is.

Mr. BOWELL. The complaint which has been made by the member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) will be enquired into. Did I understand him to say that these people were carried free on these trains?

Mr. LANGELIER. I had not finished my remarks, but I stated that one train was started from the east and one from the west to come to Rimouski, and I saw dozens of people, who were supposed to be in favour of the Minister of Militia, who showed me the kind of pass they had to go over that railway. They had not paid one cent, and they told me that hundreds of other people, in fact all the other people who were there attending the meeting, had been passed in the same way. I venture to say that no record has been made of the passes to travel on those trains. I was shown the pass they had, and it was a little piece of white paper with a hieroglyphic written on it by a Conservative wirepuller, and that is what dozens and dozens of people showed me as having passed them on board that train. I would like to have the information, because I desire to find out how much these two excursion trains paid to the Government. There were hundreds of people on these trains. There were many other special trains during the election, and I do not know what they paid to the Government, but I am speaking especially of those that came to the large meeting which was held at Rimouski a few days before the election. I do not know if any of these people paid, but all those that I saw told me they had these passes. I think it would be very important to find out how these trains were managed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can see that the hon. gentleman could not read these mysterious signs on that little bit of paper which he refers to as a pass for the friends of the Conservative party to travel free on the Intercolonial Railway. I did not see any of these pieces of paper, these pieces of ordinary paper with an extraordinary sign, and it appears to be extraordinary that the friends of the Conservative party should have selected the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) to display these passes to when I saw nothing of them. I had complaints—and the hon. gentleman will understand that in the midst of an election fight many of your friends expect you to do more than you can—from many of those who came, as the hon. gentleman truly says, from the east and from the west on those two special trains, that they could not be admitted on either of those trains without having to pay their fare. It was stated to me that orders had been issued by Mr. Schreiber or Mr. Pottinger—I will not be sure which—that every man should pay special rates, which meant excursion rates. I am positive of that, and that complaints were made in regard to their having to pay anything, and that was especially the case on that day to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) refers, when he and his friends were at that meeting at Rimouski. I did not see the mysterious white papers allowing the friends of the Conservative party to travel free. All I know is that my friends complained to me that strict orders had been issued that they must pay, and they said: You being in the Government, it seems to us very natural that you should be able to pass your friends

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

free. I said it was impossible, that I had nothing to say to the chief engineer who had the management of that road, and, as far as those I saw were concerned, I can say that they had tickets, but I do not know what colour the tickets were or what was on them.

Mr. MULOCK. Did they pay for the tickets?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot say. Certainly they did not pay me.

Mr. LANGELIER. It would be well, before we come to this question in the main Estimates, to have a statement of how many special trains went in there during that election, from what places the trains ran, how much each train cost and how much it earned?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I intimated to the Minister before that I desired to know the total amount of coal transported from the Spring Hill collieries over the Intercolonial Railway, and the rate per ton per mile which was charged.

Mr. BOWELL. I will get the information, as well as that for the hon. member for Quebec, and will state the result when we come to these items in the main Estimates.

Deficiencies in the Estimates for 1890-91 caused by the increase in the rate for mail service over the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Montreal and Vancouver..... \$75,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If, as is quite likely, there will be a long discussion on that subject, it might be well for the Minister to state now in such reasonable detail as will partly explain it, the cause of this additional sum of money being required. In that case, I dare say the general discussion can be allowed to stand, on the understanding that it will be brought up at an early date as the discussion will be brought up on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The detailed explanation might occupy a considerable time. This is simply an increased allowance for the carrying of the mails on the Canadian Pacific Railway, making the amount \$105 a mile on the full length of the road per annum. The payment before was at the rate of 12 cents per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The present arrangement is to pay \$105 a mile on the whole of the main line?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what length of time does that last?

Mr. HAGGART. Until it is changed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What notice must you give to change it?

Mr. HAGGART. We can change it at any time—three months, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you change it at a month's notice?

Mr. HAGGART. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I would ask that, before this comes up again, and at the earliest convenience of the Postmaster General, he might lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Order in Council fixing this rate, and that he might append to that the regulations showing the cost last year under the 12 cents per train mile rate.

Mr. HAGGART. It amounts to the difference between \$75 and \$105. Twelve cents a mile would be about \$75 per year. There would then be an increase of about \$30.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the practice before? Was the Canadian Pacific Railway receiving \$105 on part of its track, and 12 cents on the remainder, or was it receiving 12 cents on all?

Mr. HAGGART. This increase applies solely to the main line, the \$75,000. You will see in the other estimates, there is an increased expenditure from Montreal to St. John.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then do I understand from the Postmaster General that virtually under this vote the post office allowance to the Canadian Pacific Railway is changed from \$75 per mile to \$105 along the whole line?

Mr. HAGGART. On the main line between Montreal and Vancouver, which is 2,915 miles; it is a change from \$75 per mile per annum to \$105 per mile per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then if you will just lay the Order in Council making that change on the Table at your earliest convenience—

Mr. HAGGART. I will lay it on the Table on Monday.

Amount required to cover unprovided items for 1889-90, as per Auditor General's Report, page A-79.....\$709,748.64

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The details I find on page 78. Take, for instance, the item for railways, under the head of collection of revenue. There I see an unprovided expenditure of \$302,958. Surely that would have been foreseen before the end of the year 1890, and ought to have been provided for in the Supplementary Estimates of last year. Prorogation took place on the 23rd of May, that was within five weeks of the end of the year, and I should like to know of the Minister of Finance how it comes that so very large a sum as \$302,958 should have been left unprovided for. With common care on the part of the officials of the department that sum ought to have been foreseen, and the Government ought to have been communicated with. Were the Government communicated with, or did the officials not know before the 25th of May that so large a deficit would have to be met?

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this matter I cannot say from recollection that the Government was communicated with. I think if the Government had been communicated with, it would have brought down the sum in the Estimates to cover the deficiency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The chief official is there,

Mr. FOSTER. No, he is gone.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, he ought to be sent for, because that is a matter which, to my mind, rather reflects, and reflects seriously, on the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and is a thing about which we ought to have some explanation—unless there was some extraordinary cause which it is not easy to understand. It was that officer's duty to have communi-

cated to the Government, long before the 23rd of May, that there would be a very serious deficiency, giving the Government the option of obtaining a vote from the House. It is quite clear that, *prima facie*, this reflects gravely on the management of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. It may not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say, *prima facie* it does. The idea that this House should rise on the 23rd of May, and a department like that of railways should not know within \$302,000 what its expenditure was going to be, sheds a very ugly light on the way in which that department is managed—unless there is some explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate would have been brought down six weeks before that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the department ought, in all conscience, to have advised the Government before the House rose, that there was going to be this deficiency, if they knew it, and it was very difficult to see how they could have avoided knowing it. I do not myself complain about a moderate sum of unprovided items, knowing that these expenses will occur. For instance, in the Post Office, which is our nearly next largest expending department, there were items unprovided for to the amounts of \$56,230, and lapsed balances to the amount of \$56,319; so that I would not be at all disposed to complain of that. There are always certain amounts in each department which lapse over, but here you will see there was only an insignificant lapsed balance of \$15,900, and this huge gap.

Mr. FOSTER. If you look at A-74 you will see that the whole of that amount is covered by Governor General's warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but that is exactly what the Governor General's warrant should not be taken for, unless there was a reasonable ground for alleging that it was entirely unforeseen. That is an abuse of the Governor General's warrants, and we have been complaining against the system for several years back in this House. The departments, knowing that the Governor General's warrant is issued nowadays without sufficient investigation—I do not reflect on the hon. gentlemen, but I speak of the facts—knowing that they neglect to apprise the Government before the House rises of the fact that the expenditure is to be largely exceeded; and then we come to have such items as this one before us.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether the Governor General's warrant was taken before the House or not, it should have been covered in the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A thing of that kind could by no possibility escape the attention of the Ministers. Long before 24th of May they must have known there was going to be a big gap.

Mr. FOSTER. I think probably that Governor's warrant was got before the House met in 1891, not after it had risen. That fact is no justification, for the amount should have been embodied in the Estimates if it was issued before the House met.

Mr. MULOCK. Why should not the reports of Ministers on which Governor General's warrants are issued be laid on the Table. We have simply a statement, but not a report.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman would obtain much more information if that were done.

Mr. MULOCK. Then what is the use of the reports to the Governor General?

Mr. FOSTER. The report, if the hon. gentleman got it, would inform him that so much money was required, and there was no appropriation out of which it could be taken, and it was so declared on the report of the Minister of Finance, and, therefore, a Governor General's warrant do issue. In some cases there might be a more detailed statement. The hon. gentleman fears there is not a truly strict revision of Governor General's warrants. He is more or less right as regards the past, and it may be there is too much laxity at present; but, so far as I am concerned, I have tried during the past year to revise all such statements, and before I sign the report to satisfy myself, as far as possible, that there was really a ground for issuing a warrant. Then we have adopted a new principle within the last few months, that all Governor General's warrants before being passed by Council shall be referred to the Treasury Board and undergo the revision of that board. That, I think, will be a very good extra check on the issue of Governor General's warrants. So the hon. gentleman will see that every disposition exists to keep as nearly as possible to the line.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance says the reports of Ministers would not throw light on the matter. The report of the Minister should not be a mere echo of the statute, but it should contain on the face of it the facts that warrant the exercise of this special power. The facts form the basis on which the Council comes to a conclusion on the application.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite right in that, and it was that consideration which led to the determination to refer the reports to the Treasury Board. Since that reference has been made several instances have occurred in which we have had officials from the departments to give information as to the necessity of issuing Governor General's warrants.

Mr. MULOCK. Then in future these reports will be of service, and will be laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to laying them on the Table, if the House wants them—that is, any that may be called for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see that the change suggested by the Minister will quite meet the case. If a Minister is without the necessary funds he applies to his colleagues for a Governor General's warrant, and that if it is referred to the Treasury Board I suppose the only question that can come before it is whether the money is required in the public service, and there is no appropriation for the purpose. I do not suppose the Treasury Board would prevent the money being obtained, if it were made perfectly clear that no appropriation existed and that money for the purpose was required. But it will be seen from an examination of the Act that while it may be necessary that the money should be obtained, it is not such a necessity as is contemplated by the provisions of the Auditor's Act authorizing the issuing of Governor General's warrants. It is the duty of officials of the department to inform the Minister as to the

Mr. MULOCK.

money required for the public service of that department, and there is great neglect of duty if that information has not been given in order that the appropriation should be had at the hands of the House. The statement of the Minister of Finance shows great neglect of duties in these particulars. If the money has not been appropriated, why was not application made to Parliament for an adequate sum for the public service? What is contemplated by the Auditor's Act is an appropriation upon a Governor General's warrant for some unforeseen emergency. There may be some public work which the Government require to maintain, destroyed by fire, or in some other way. There may be something arising which requires an appropriation of which neither any Minister nor the House could know anything at the time the appropriation was sought. But these sums which are provided in the Supplementary Estimates by Governor General's warrants are sums wanted in the ordinary course of the administration of each department, and it certainly indicates very great laxity in the administration of the affairs of the department when the authority is employed for the purpose of supplementing the sum asked that ought to have been provided when the House was in session.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the House the fullest information before concurrence.

Country Savings Banks, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island—	
Salaries.....	\$11,650
Contingencies.....	1,750

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is a small decrease in this item.

Mr. FOSTER. That is because, according to our policy, these savings banks are being absorbed into the post office savings banks whenever by death or other cause the incumbent for the time being vacates the office. By this means we save a considerable portion of that vote and add very little expense to the management of the post office savings banks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to learn that the Government is going to carry out that policy. Has this reduction been caused by the death of any of the office-holders?

Mr. FOSTER. We transferred three savings banks last year; the keepers of two having died and one keeper having resigned.

One-half of 1 per cent commission on \$7,222,271.57 for payment of interest on public debt.....	\$36,101.35
---	-------------

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we quite leave this subject of the savings banks I would like to ask the hon. Minister, although I shall not press him to answer the question unless he chooses—I would be glad to know whether any sort of understanding has been come to, or whether he expects to come to any sort of understanding with the various banking institutions of the country as to the rate of interest? The alterations which were made last year in the Banking Act would, in my judgment, under certain conditions, render that possible. It is an important question of policy, and if the hon. gentleman for any reason does not see proper to make any statement upon it, I shall not press the question further.

Mr. FOSTER. You mean the interest on deposits?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, as to whether any arrangement has been made, or is likely to be made with the banks on this subject, so as to create something like a uniformity, and prevent heavy loss.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a subject which has been engaging my attention for the last four or five months, and although I am not able to make any definite statement now, I may say that the Government has been in communication with the banks with that end in view, and that so far the prospects seem—I think I may say—fair towards that conclusion which will, I think, be beneficial all round. I would not like to make a more explicit statement at the present time upon that subject, but simply to say to my hon. friend that it is engaging my attention and that communications are at present being had upon it. It would be desirable for the banks, and desirable for us as large holders of deposits, that a uniform and fair rate of interest should be agreed upon, if it can be agreed upon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one other point which I would like a little information about. I do not know exactly what relations the hon. gentleman has with our chief bank; that is to say, the Bank of Montreal; but it still continues practically to all intents and purposes the Government bank. I observe that the bank has been in a number of instances rather outbidding the Government whose banker it is. It seemed to me a rather strange proceeding that the Bank of Montreal, which is the Government banker, should be offering a higher rate of interest for deposits than the Government are paying, in the shape of savings banks opened, as one might say, almost in direct competition with the Government in many places. Has the hon. gentleman any information to give on that point, which is a distinct and specific point in the administration?

Mr. FOSTER. No changes have been made in the relations between the Government, so far as its deposits and business is concerned, and the Bank of Montreal—which, as my hon. friend says, is the chief bank with which we do our business—except this: that, possibly, the Bank of Montreal may have had, during the past year, reason for complaining that the usual amount of money kept on deposit was not kept on deposit by us, we having been obliged to let it run very low at times. The Bank of Montreal has established a savings bank branch. It has had to do that, possibly, to some extent on account of the competition of other banks, but I do not think it was the first, by any means, to introduce the system. The arrangement which is possible and about which we had a conversation a few moments ago, may obviate that to a certain extent; that is, it may eventuate in a uniform rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The only reason that I make that remark is this: that, unless the circumstances had been very exceptional, the spectacle of the Government banker outbidding the Government for deposits, as was done in a great many cases, is peculiar, to say the least of it, and there is no doubt that the Government lost heavily under the operation, and that a very considerable number of deposits were transferred straight to

the Bank of Montreal. Now, had the Bank of Montreal no communication with the Government, there is not a word to say; but, in the very close relation which the Bank of Montreal is to the Government, it strikes me as slightly peculiar they should have done a thing of that kind, unless by previous conference with the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. How many different holders are there of Canadian stock? The reason I ask the question is that each year we have an item of \$36,000 odd, being one-half of 1 per cent., for paying out the interest on the Government debt. The work of distributing dividends is merely clerical work, and \$36,000 a year for distributing a little over \$7,000,000 does strike one as a pretty high figure.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will recollect that this matter has been up for years; and ever since Confederation we are under an agreement with agents by which certain commissions are paid to them, commissions on the negotiations of loans and on the payment of interest. If we take the net percentage of the ten years preceding this ten year period, we will find that the amounts which we paid were much larger than those which we are paying now. The last arrangement, which was made in 1882, I think, contemplated an existence of ten years, and the rates were largely reduced from what had been previously paid for all these services. That arrangement is subject to denunciation in 1892. I have already been in communication with our agents, and when we can revise that, we shall go over the whole matter with a view of making, if possible, better arrangements. However, it has been a fundamental principle hitherto that we must have the aid of strong and reputable houses in London in making our loans, and we have always found it the wisest course in doing our work there. I do not know whether any revision can be made which will result more favourably. That remains to be seen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observed, as I think everybody did, with great regret, that one of our financial agents, the house of Baring Bros., had been compelled to suspend and go into liquidation. I am aware that no loss was sustained by the Government; but at the same time, when this item is up, it is necessary for us to know first of all whether the Barings, or rather the limited liability firm which takes their name, are retained as the agents of the Government for the time being, and also what their intentions may be. Without in the slightest degree desiring to reflect on Baring Bros., who are always, I believe, so far as we were concerned, very useful and valuable friends, it is a matter of grave question whether their successors are able to render services at all commensurate with those rendered by the great house of Baring Bros.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that the present firm of Baring Bros. are retained as our agents. Of course, one cannot say very much about that; but it is a matter that is engaging the consideration of the Government. My deputy is over in London just now in connection with some financial transactions which we are carrying on. He was over last year in connection with a temporary loan, at the time the troubles were at the acute stage; and, on consideration of the matter then, it was considered advisable, under all the circumstances, not to

change our agency in that respect. I have here a statement of the agents' commission. In 1881 one per cent. was paid on payment of dividends and principal on maturity on Canada 6 per cents., and on the first issue of Intercolonial Railway 4 per cents., and one-half per cent. on all other guaranteed bonds and ordinary Dominion loans. On 1st January, 1882, the other arrangement was made, and it is terminable on one year's notice from and after January, 1892, so that it is only terminable on the 1st January, 1893. By that arrangement, instead of one per cent., we pay one-half per cent. on interest and sinking funds; one per cent. on all new loans, to cover all charges, except stamp duty and actual brokerage payments; no commission on loans negotiated by the agent; one-half per cent. on conversion of Canada fives and other securities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that apply to the old loans, of which there are some outstanding?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The only provision is that on any loans where the charge is less than one-half per cent., it is not to be raised.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister seems to justify this high expenditure for commissions on the ground that it is necessary to have strong financial agents in London. I thought he had taken the ground that his Administration had so improved the credit of Canada that it could take care of itself, and that it was not necessary to bolster it up by such arrangements as that which he is compelled to resort to. I called attention last year to the manner in which the sinking fund that was redeemed was taken care of, and I call attention to the same matter now. I understand that some of the bonds are payable to bearer. I suppose our agents in London redeemed some of our public debts. What becomes of the redeemed debt? It is not cancelled, I understand, but is still kept alive when it falls due, and is redeemed by sinking fund.

Mr. FOSTER. That is retained, of course. It is still an investment.

Mr. MULOCK. In whose hands is that investment?

Mr. FOSTER. In the hands of trustees.

Mr. MULOCK. Who are they?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember their names.

Mr. MULOCK. Could the hon. Minister state the amount of Government securities in the hands of trustees?

Mr. FOSTER. About \$22,000,000, I think.

Mr. MULOCK. The trustees have control over these securities.

Mr. FOSTER. They hold them in trust.

Mr. MULOCK. They are negotiable.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they are held in trust investments.

Mr. MULOCK. They are in the hands of the trustees, and would be negotiable if the trustees chose to commit a breach of trust.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, they are simply bought upon the market by trustees, just as any person else would buy them. Then they are held by the trustees, and instead of the inter-

Mr. FOSTER.

est being paid it is kept and added to the investment, and in that way it accumulates.

Mr. MULOCK. That is just the position in which I understood it to be, and that is why I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that to-day \$22,000,000 of these securities of Canada are in the hands of trustees. I will assume that they are good strong men; but apparently their standing is not of sufficient importance to impress their names on the Minister's memory. This system of redeeming securities is going on, and year by year there will be larger amounts of trust securities in the hands of trustees, and we are running an unnecessary risk, it seems to me, in leaving our securities beyond our control, even in the hands of trustees. I felt a degree of anxiety when the crisis occurred last year, knowing that a large quantity of the securities of Canada were held by the bank in question in trust for the people of Canada. I am glad to know that nothing has occurred to occasion any loss to the country; but it is not a satisfactory position, in my opinion, and I trust that the Minister, now that he is going to revise our whole financial arrangements, will make provision for doing away with any unnecessary risk. I am unable to understand why we cannot cancel the redeemed debt at maturity and be done with it, instead of keeping the securities alive, a source of danger. In all future issues, it seems to me it would be a wiser plan to provide for redemption and payment of interest at the same time.

Mr. FOSTER. There is the condition of the law.

Mr. MULOCK. I know you cannot alter existing contracts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. Minister know whether these various securities, amounting to \$20,000,000 or thereabouts, are in the position of inscribed stock, or whether any portion are held as bonds?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say what proportion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have several times mentioned the extreme desirability of having all those put in as inscribed stock. When they are put in as inscribed stock, instead of as bonds, I think that, so far as the security goes, it would probably be sufficient; for, if my memory serves me, one of the trustees is our own Receiver General. We have altered the status of that functionary so often that I really forget whether the Minister of Finance does not combine in his own person the position of Receiver General. I think he does, and in that case these securities should be in his name as well as in the name of one or perhaps both our financial agents. I rather think there are three trustees.

Mr. FOSTER. There are three at least.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that if our Finance Minister and one of our agents and some third party be the holders of the inscribed stock, specifically described as in trust, there would not be any very material danger.

Mr. MULOCK. Quite so; but it seems to me all the securities should be in Canada. I understand that the redeemed bonds are in London, England. Why not have them in our own custody here?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean the sinking fund or the redeemed debt?

Mr. MULOCK. The redeemed debt.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean those which have been used for the sinking fund or those where the debt is matured?

Mr. MULOCK. I mean where they have been redeemed out of the sinking fund.

Mr. FOSTER. These are held by trustees.

Mr. MULOCK. They should be here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whenever any purchases are made and invested in inscribed stock, the bonds must be delivered up and destroyed. Two classes of securities cannot remain outstanding.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite so. I know that the last year or two the drift has been entirely towards the change to inscribed stock.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. Minister could, at a later date, give the information to the Committee as to whether any of the debentures which have been redeemed are now in London and where they are.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did I understand the hon. Minister to say that it required a year's notice before any change could take place in our financial agents?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, from the 1st of January, 1882. It is a ten years' arrangement.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the contract is for ten years, it would expire itself without notice.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a condition of the contract that, at the end of a certain time, it can be terminated on giving one year's notice.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I notice that one-half of 1 per cent has been paid. Of course it is a very large amount, \$36,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is one-half what we formerly paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Still it should be less. Does the hon. Minister look forward to being able to utilize our High Commissioner in any financial arrangements in London with regard to our debt? I remember when the late First Minister made the statement in the House, at the time of the appointment of the High Commissioner, that he would be of decided advantage to us in financial matters in London. Does the hon. gentleman expect to be able to use him so as to save us a considerable portion of this money?

Mr. FOSTER. The High Commissioner in London is in a position to be of great service to Canada in connection with our financial arrangements, and the negotiations of loans, in the way of advice and co-operation. In those respects he has been of great service and will continue to be of great service, but I do not think he could ever take the place of a banking house or firm in these operations. If my hon. friend were acquainted with the *modus operandi* of the London market, he would see that, under present conditions, it is quite impossible for the High Commissioner to take the place of our banking agents in the negotiations of loans. He could not do so any more than I could myself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with that matter I must reiterate the remark which I made before, and which has been made several times from this side. If our High Commissioner in London is to meddle in any London transactions whatever, I must say that it is extremely inexpedient that he should be mixed up in any form or shape with companies of any sort or description. Mischief will arise, as mischief has arisen, and I think it should be distinctly intimated by the Finance Department, whose servant, for that matter, he is, that the High Commissioner should, if he is to be trusted in any financial matter at all, abstain from any dealings with other companies of any kind or description.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be extremely unwise to mix up the present High Commissioner with our finances. He has had connection of a more or less intimate character with several financial enterprises, and I have not heard that they have succeeded. I do not know that it is because of his connection with those financial associations, but it is necessary for us to have our business in the hands of a strong financial man, and we can hardly regard our present High Commissioner in that light.

Mr. McMULLEN. If in the opinion I have expressed I am astray, I was led astray by the remarks of the late First Minister, made by him some years ago, when impressing on the House the desirability of appointing a High Commissioner, who, he said, would save us in commissions much more than would be expended by the creation of that office. I quite agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that it is highly desirable our present High Commissioner, mixed up as he has been with some of those concerns with which his name has been associated during the past year, should not have anything to do with our financial arrangements. For instance, a company which has been formed recently and with which, I understand, he is connected, has completely collapsed; and certainly the man whom we send over to the other side for the purpose of representing us should not allow himself to be mixed up with such questionable concerns, to the serious impairment of our credit and dignity in the financial world. We should rather have a representative who will keep up the credit and dignity of this country as a borrowing country. I hope the Finance Minister will see that if in future we are to become borrowers, we should be represented by an official in London whose career, financially and otherwise, will reflect credit on us, and who will keep free of these questionable associations with which our present High Commissioner has become connected within the last two or three months.

Expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes. . \$5,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What are these expenses?

Mr. FOSTER. You will find them detailed in the Auditor General's Report, page B-23. It has reference to the counting of the notes in the department, taking them in, numbering them and destroying them.

Mr. CHARLTON. When these notes are brought in are they cancelled and new ones issued?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, whenever they are damaged in the least, they are cancelled and destroyed, and all precautions are taken in regard to the destruc-

tion. That also takes in the signing of the notes. Of late we have had one name lithographed, but the other has to be signed.

Mr. CHARLTON. What precautions are taken to prevent the cancelled notes from being put in circulation again?

Mr. FOSTER. They are immediately destroyed?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who superintends their destruction?

Mr. FOSTER. The comptroller.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many have been cancelled since the issue commenced?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot state now.

Mr. MULLOCK. Who witnesses the destruction?

Mr. FOSTER. There are certain officers who do that. There is the comptroller, and, I think, the accountant.

Mr. MULLOCK. It is not usual to have only one officer to supervise the destruction?

Mr. FOSTER. No, there are two or three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There should not be less than three.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there are three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the highest denomination of notes which are issued?

Mr. FOSTER. We have \$1,000 notes, and, I think, we have \$5,000 notes for the securities in the banks. In fact, I think, we have as high as \$10,000 notes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What form of securities are you issuing in London just now?

Mr. FOSTER. Treasury bills.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they exactly similar in form to the English Treasury bills?

Mr. FOSTER. Precisely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that involve the deposit of any security?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these only for a period of one year?

Mr. FOSTER. The present issue is only for one year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And at what rate?

Mr. FOSTER. Four per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they payable half-yearly?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Printing Dominion notes.....\$50,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How is this work done? Is it by contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, by contract.

Mr. CHARLTON. By whom is the work done?

Mr. FOSTER. It is done by Mr. Burland in the new building which he put up here in Ottawa about two years ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. To what extent were tenders invited for this work?

MR. FOSTER. This is an old question which has been discussed here before. The contract has

Mr. FOSTER.

been running for four years and, I think, terminates in October.

Mr. MULLOCK. What is the rate allowed for printing these notes?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the contract here, but you can find out the rate by the statement on page B—23 of the Auditor General's Report, where the number of notes and the price of the sheets are stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It amounts to about 6 cents per note.

Mr. MULLOCK. I think the amount of Dominion notes in circulation is about \$16,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. About that.

Mr. MULLOCK. I have been told by banks that the cost of printing their bills amounts to about 1 cent each. I do not know what the average life of a bill may be, or how many million dollars worth of bills are printed a year.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the average life of our bills is rather less than that of the bank bills because we are careful to keep them as clean as possible.

Mr. MULLOCK. I understand that 1 cent a bill is what the banks calculate as the cost of printing.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot state just now what is the cost of printing our bills or the bills of the banks, but I know that we have the right of revision each year under the contract, and each year an investigation is made. The last investigation which was made—I think January—showed me that this firm were doing the work at as cheap rates as it was being done in the best houses in New York.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many notes would be contained in one issue?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell you now, but I will find out and give you the whole cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What we want to know is roughly what is the cost per note. Of course there would be a difference in regard to the large notes of which only a small number are printed, but say in reference to the one's and two's.

Printing, advertising, inspection, expressage, miscellaneous charges, including commutation of stamp duty. \$10,000

Mr. CHARLTON. This requires a little explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. You will see the account of expenses under that in the Auditor General's Report, page B—23. It takes in the advertising by our agents in London and the express charges on silver and notes and the like of that, as well as legal services, the travelling expenses of the financial inspector and the assistant inspector, and the stamp duties on the inscribed bonds at home.

Committee rose, and it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 16) to amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.—(Mr. Hazen.)

Bill (No. 121) to amend an Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

Bill (No. 123) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to "The Oshawa Railway Company."—(Mr. Madill.)

Bill (No. 124) further to amend an Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railroad and Coal Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. Having passed the items with regard to financial management we have taken up all the individual items I propose to ask the Committee to pass during this sitting. I have had a conference with the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and owing to the peculiar circumstances under which we are placed, having entered upon the new year with expenditure constantly accruing and the different services of the country going on, we are at present without any funds for current expenses. Any appropriations made for last year, the balances of which are left, cannot be used, of course, for any expenditure for the present year. In order to facilitate matters and have the business of the country and its service to go on smoothly we have agreed to take up the different items untouched, and to pass one-tenth of each appropriation asked for without discussion, leaving nine-tenths of each appropriation afterwards, when the fullest discussion will be allowed on each item. After we have passed these, I will ask the House to go into concurrence on the Estimates already passed and these resolutions, so that they may receive their several readings and be put in the form of a Bill and assented to as quickly as possible. That being so, then the first item is for census and statistics, the full amount asked being \$175,000, and the resolutions will be taken in their order, each calling for one-tenth of the amount asked for in the vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we should strike any item that is looked upon on this side of the House as being very objectionable it might be allowed to stand and another item allowed to take its place.

Mr. FOSTER. That cannot be. The hon. gentleman might object, for example, to the item for dredging, and ask that it be allowed to stand. The result of that would be that the Minister of Public Works would have to discharge his men

and do nothing towards dredging. It is plainly impossible to allow the items to stand if we wish to help the services of the country, but I do not think any items will be found so objectionable that one-tenth cannot be passed without discussion.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman as I understood him at the private conference to which he has alluded, intends to take such items as are absolutely required to carry on the business of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not ask for any vote of one-tenth for new services, for public works not commenced.

Mr. LAURIER. Only for services going on now. There can be no objection to that principle, and the only objection can be to the amount of the item and these we can discuss later; but to-day in order to carry on the business of the country, I consent with great pleasure to the proposal of the hon. gentleman.

Prince Edward Island—Extension of
Cape Traverse Wharf..... \$40,000

Mr. FOSTER. That item is to be withdrawn.

Mr. LAURIER. Why is it withdrawn?

Mr. FOSTER. In the revision of the Estimates, it was put in by mistake.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there no necessity for that extension there?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no extension to be undertaken this year.

Mr. LAURIER. That does not answer my question. I asked if it is required or not?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not considered to be required this year.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply, May 19, 22, 26; June 5, 16, 30; July 2 and 3.

Intercolonial Railway..... \$300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister can give the explanation of this now?

Mr. FOSTER. I have seen the chief engineer since that vote was passed, and the information I have gathered from him is that the deficiency arose from an error in estimating. The Supplementary Estimate was made on the 1st January, 1890, and there were two things which he did not take into consideration. Basing his estimate on the receipts and expenditures of the preceding year, he thought the estimate was sufficient, but he left these two things out of consideration. One was purely an error, a want of thought, and that was that an amount would be required for the new railing which takes place at the end of the year, and which, in that case, amounted to nearly \$200,000. That was a pure omission, something which escaped his mind. The other part was the added expenditure due to the opening up of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the consequent passage of extra trains from St. John to Halifax over the Intercolonial Railway. These two sums made up nearly the sum of \$300,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then are we to understand that, in addition to the cost of sub-

sidizing a road across the State of Maine, an extra expenditure of \$300,000 is to be saddled upon the country for the special convenience of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, and I did not say whether the expense from that alone was \$100,000. The new railing cost about \$200,000, and there would be required about \$100,000 to make up the deficiency, but whether the whole of that was caused by the new trains being put on I do not know. There may have been some other deficiency included in that. Of course, that takes no account of what would be the extra receipts from the extra trains between St. John and Halifax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand the matter, all the explanation the engineer gives is that, in January, 1890, he made certain omissions. Now, before the 23rd May, 1890, it must have been clear to him that his supplementary estimate would be enormously exceeded, and what I desire to know is whether any representations to that effect were made by the department prior to the 23rd May.

Mr. FOSTER. The engineer did not tell me that he had made any, and, if that error or omission had escaped his attention, he probably did not call the attention of the Government to it before the House adjourned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The omission must have occurred in January and not in May?

Mr. FOSTER. We adjourned in May.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that we adjourned on the 23rd May, about five weeks before the termination of the fiscal year, and it appears to me that it was impossible that the engineer in charge of the Intercolonial Railway should not have known by that time that his estimates would be \$300,000 short. If he did not know it by that time, it is difficult to understand how he can be fit for his position.

Mr. FOSTER. There might be an omission of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of \$300,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Of what might be necessary for the new railing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can understand that in January it might be possible that such an omission, though a very extraordinary one, should have taken place, but that, by the 23rd of May, by which time I take it a very large portion of these new rails had been put on, he should not have discovered how seriously astray he had been seems impossible on the supposition that the engineer knew what was going on upon the Intercolonial Railway. If we had closed say at the end of March, such a thing might be barely possible, but, closing on the 23rd May, it is almost entirely out of the question that the engineer should not have known it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the explanation I have received.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that I must say is a very unsatisfactory explanation. Now, is there any necessity that these unprovided items should be passed? The money has actually been paid, every penny of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER. All paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, I think we had better let the item stand, because we would have to bring it up in some form afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. If you think that is necessary, I do not think I can give you any further explanation on that. I might get something fuller.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I know the hon. gentleman is giving me exactly what has been stated to him; I am not imputing any blame to him. But the whole circumstances connected with this show such an extraordinary negligence, such extraordinary looseness in keeping the accounts, that it is necessary we should have some more explanation. Therefore, I shall ask the hon. gentleman to let this stand, as no possible detriment can accrue to the public service thereby.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow it to pass, the explanations can be asked and received just the same as on the item for the Intercolonial Railway in the main Estimates. Keeping these little tid-bits floating around is not desirable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it must be distinctly understood that we will have the power of returning to these unprovided items—

Mr. FOSTER. To this one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And also that the engineer will be here, and that some more satisfactory explanation will be given than we have had.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get as full explanation as I can.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If there is any explanation to be had.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.15 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Order of Canadian Home Circles.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) to amend the North-West Territories Act. He said: This Act is very similar to the one introduced last year. It provides for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly for three years, making clear a doubt that existed about the provision of the Bill of last session on this point. It proposes to abolish the advisory council and the