

land claimed by Mr. Willet was worth \$300. Certain parties in Shelburne, to whom I wrote, put a higher valuation on it, but left out of sight the fact that Mr. Willet had a life lease. Considering this fact and the smallness of the rent, we felt that Col. Coffin's was a fair valuation. On my writing to Mr. Willet for a higher sum, he answered he thought \$300 was more than the island was worth, and that if we did not choose to accept it he would receive back his money and give up the island. I then concluded that the \$300 should be accepted, and ordered a patent to issue; and so the matter stood when we left office.

**Mr. BLAKE.** We have made very good resolutions as to the propriety of avoiding the system of arrears in connection with those Ordnance lands, and there is very considerable need of such a policy. I want to read a sentence or two from the right hon. gentleman's report with reference to the North-West Railway lands, which possesses some bearing on this point:

"I regret to have to report that, even at this early date, at what is the mere initiation of a system of *time* sales of railway lands, there is already experienced difficulty of obtaining punctual payment of instalments due."

"The experience of the department of the steady accumulation of arrears of payments, in case of similar sales of Ordnance lands, would lead to the inference that, unless the extreme measure is resorted to of prompt cancellation of sale on default of payment of any instalment, this evil is likely to increase."

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** No doubt it is much more satisfactory to get the money in our hands. When we established the regulations for time sales, we had to contend against the very liberal terms offered to settlers in the United States. Our country was more remote from the general current of emigration, and we were told, I think by hon. gentlemen opposite, that we had no people for our lands, or very few, and in order to offer proper inducements, we did sell on time. If, however, arrears accumulate inconveniently, we can alter that policy, and demand ready money for all sales, or a system similar to that of the United States. Then hon. gentlemen opposite will not, I hope, attack us for the illiberality of our regulations.

**Mr. BLAKE.** The hon. gentleman misapprehends the report, which does not refer to the subject of his motion, but to the sales of railway lands for speculators' purchase. With reference to his apprehension of being accused of illiberality by us, if he alters his policy, I beg to remind him that we pressed upon him, when he announced a plan of sales to speculators—not on condition of settlement, but on time—its objectionable character; we denounced it, and told him that sales ought to be for cash, and not on time, and it is with reference to that passage in the report that I spoke. I suppose the hon. gentleman, having brought down his report, approves of it, though he does not appear to have read it. I hope he will carry out this policy of the Opposition, which they earnestly urged last Session.

201. *Contingencies.*—Amount required to pay Sir Alex. Galt, expenditure incurred by him in establishing his office in London, over and above amount already voted..... \$1,294 07

In reply to **Mr. BLAKE,**

**Sir LEONARD TILLEY.** Last Session a vote was taken of \$3,000 to pay the expenses of the removal of Sir Alex. Galt and his establishment to London. The whole expenditure, as submitted by the accounts of Sir Alexander, and vouchers attached, was \$4,294.07, and therefore this vote of \$1,294.07 is required to pay the difference.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Then it has nothing to do with the expenses of his office?

**Sir LEONARD TILLEY.** \$3,000 were voted for the last fiscal year, \$4,000 has been voted for the present fiscal year. \$3,000 were not sufficient to take Sir Alex. Galt over and establish him in London, and therefore \$1,294 additional is required.

204. *Dorchester Penitentiary, to pay the salaries of the Warden, \$1,000, and the Deputy Warden, \$600, from the 1st September, 1879, to the 1st July, 1880.....* \$1,600 00

In reply to **Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,**

**Mr. McDONALD (Pictou).** The term "salaries" is not exactly correct. We expected the year before last to get into the penitentiary on 1st September. The Department of Public Works, who had charge of the construction and finishing of the prison, reported that the prison would be ready, and the Department of Justice made the necessary arrangements for transferring prisoners from Halifax and St. John to Dorchester. The warden and deputy warden were appointed by Minute of Council early in September. It afterwards turned out that the prison was not ready for occupation until the following July, and the warden and deputy warden were more or less engaged during the nine months which intervened between the date of their appointments and the time the prison was occupied, although they were not occupied as departmental officers; and the Government thought it only fair that they should be paid something, and they were voted \$1,000 and \$600 respectively.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I do not understand why this vote was not brought down last Session. The difficulty had occurred. The Minister of Justice brought down the vote for Dorchester Penitentiary, having arranged the salaries of the warden and deputy warden.

**Mr. McDONALD.** We wished to have the expenses of this prison settled irrespective of an extra claim like this. Besides, I do not know that the country lost much, if the claim is a proper one, by letting it wait.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I suspect that the people had not to wait very long, for I fancy that they have been paid long ago.

**Mr. McDONALD.** No; they have not.

**Mr. BLAKE.** It certainly was stated, whether in the press or in this House I cannot now remember, that these appointments had been made at a premature date, and it was replied that no harm was done because other men were not paid any salary, so no further question was raised on that subject. But we find that these men were appointed, their salaries fixed, and next year comes a proposition to pay a considerable sum of money, occasioned by these premature appointments. If the arrangements of the Board of Works were so much out of the way, as the hon. gentleman has stated, I am surprised, having regard to the administration of that department, that there should have been such a miscarriage of calculations as to the time when the prison should be ready. I think, perhaps, there was more anxiety on the part of those persons to be appointed than any anxiety on the part of the Government to proceed in such a way that there would be a necessity for appointing them. Surely it would have been enough for the Government to have told them that they would be appointed when the prison was ready for them, instead of appointing them nine months before they were required, and then proposing to give them \$1,600 because they were appointed before they were required.

**Mr. McDONALD.** I do not know what my hon. friend saw in the press, but if there was any such statement as the hon. gentleman says, I have only to say that there was no authority for that statement. The delay which took place in regard to the preparation necessary lie at the door of hon. gentlemen opposite, for if the work had been prosecuted with vigor and these contracts given with punctuality, we had reason to suppose that the prison would have been completed and the Public Works Department would not have been in a position to find themselves so entirely wrong in their calculations. There is this, however, to be said about the services of these men: that some one was required to perform the duties which