

been heard? Has any judgment been given? If not, what has been the occasion of the delay?

Mr. THOMPSON. The case had not been heard. The occasion of the delay is this: The evidence was taken in the cause during the early part of last summer, and, at the instance of the counsel for the Crown, a day was fixed in the month of July, before the judge of the Court of Vice Admiralty, when the trial should take place. When the trial was fixed, application was made on behalf of the defence to have a commission issued to take the evidence of a number of witnesses who would not return to their homes, being engaged in fishing, until the fall. Therefore, the commission was delayed until late in the year, and then the engagements of the judges and the counsel made it impossible that the case could be heard. In the meantime, it was agreed between the counsel for the Crown and the defence, that the cause should stand until the day was fixed for hearing the case of the *Ella M. Doughty*. The evidence in the latter cause has just been completed, and I have been informed that an application has been made for the two cases to be heard together.

#### ST. LAWRENCE CANALS.

Mr. BROWN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to enlarge the St. Lawrence Canals, so that vessels of as large a capacity as those passing through the Welland Canal can proceed through the St. Lawrence Canals without breaking bulk?

Mr. POPE. Some considerable work is being done every year on the St. Lawrence Canals. It is not the intention of the Government just now to bring down a very large appropriation after the very large expenditures we have been making, but the Government have every interest in continuing the enlargement of those canals.

#### TOBACCO DUTY.

Mr. BOURASSA, in the absence of Mr. BEAUSOLEIL, asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a fair measure of protection to the tobacco-growing industry by abolishing the duties and license fees now imposed, and allowing farmers to sell their tobacco to manufacturers of tobacco and cigars, who also make use of foreign tobacco, without an increase of duty, or by granting a bonus for the cultivation and manufacture of Canadian tobacco, or otherwise?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to make any statement affecting the Tariff before the Budget is brought down.

#### THE "JAMAICA" PULLMAN CAR.

Mr. SOMERVILLE moved for:

Return showing the expenses, if any, in detail with dates incurred, by the several members of the Government, and any other person or persons accompanying them, charged on account of travelling expenses while journeying in the "Jamaica" Pullman car, together with a statement of all sums paid by Ministers to any, and to what, railway corporations for use of said car, and transport of same over their roads, and all incidental expenses of any description connected therewith, from the 30th day of June, 1886, to the 1st of April, 1887; also a return showing all other travelling expenses, in detail, of the several members of the Government, and of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner, from the 30th June, 1886, to 1st April, 1887.

He said: The people of Ontario are pretty well aware of the number of trips which were made by the right hon. the leader of the Government and his colleagues during last summer and autumn and winter in this well known Pullman car "Jamaica." I have no desire to have a minute statement of the expenses incurred by the hon. gentlemen in their trips through the country for the purpose of making converts to their particular political views, because I do not think it would be well to enquire into the details

very closely. I would not care, for instance, to know whether the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries refreshed himself with high class wines, or was satisfied with Carling's ale, or took pure water during the trips he made on those occasions. I do not wish to have the details of the expenses incurred by the First Minister when he visited the Indian reserves for the purpose, as Superintendent General of the Indians, of influencing them to record their votes in favor of what he supposed to be good government in this country. But I think if expenses were incurred by members of this Government in those trips throughout the Province of Ontario, which were not only intended to influence the Dominion elections, but which were intended to influence the Local elections which took place prior to the Dominion elections—I say, if such expenses were incurred, the people ought not to pay them, but if expenses were incurred which the people of this country would have to pay, I think it is due to this House and to the people of the country that we should know the amounts which were expended by these gentlemen in their peregrinations throughout the country in what was known as the celebrated chestnut combination. I believe that was the title bestowed upon the hon. gentlemen on that occasion when they visited the rural constituencies in Ontario for the purpose of influencing the elections. I think it is due to the people of this country and due to the members of this House, that we should have as soon as possible, details of the expenses of those excursions which were made. I know that Ministers of the Crown ought to be allowed all reasonable travelling expenses when they are discharging the duties of their several departments; I do not think this House or the people would expect a Minister of the Crown to incur expenses connected with his Department in travelling over the country, without meeting the bill. But if these hon. gentlemen expect that the country ought to pay their personal expenses when they are on electioneering tours, I do not think that the idea will commend itself to the people who have to foot the bill. Then, with regard to other expenses of the Ministers, I think it is well that we should have a return brought down at as early a date as possible. Last Session I asked for a return in connection with such expenses, and up to this time, at least according to the report of the Secretary of State, that return has not been brought down. I do not think that is paying proper attention to the requirements of Parliament, because if we pass an order that a return should be brought down, I think that we ought to have it brought down in some kind of season. And then with regard to the High Commissioner, I think it would be interesting to the people of this country to know something with regard to his travelling expenses. We all know that since he has been appointed to that high position in England, he has made several flying trips to this country. We know that on the last trip he made to this country, when he came over, as he stated to a reporter in New York, he had no idea that an election was impending in this country. Since that time we have learned that he took an active part in the election, and I think it is due to the people of this country to be made aware of the facts in connection with his visit here. If he came here as an official of the Government, as High Commissioner in the discharge of the duties of that office, of course we ought to pay his expenses; but, if he came here with the purpose of assisting in the election campaign, I think it is right that he should pay his own expenses. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the High Commissioner enjoys a very handsome salary in his office in London. He gets \$10,000 a year, and I see by the Public Accounts this year that he is paid no less a sum than \$3,609 76 for contingencies. Now, if he sees fit to come to this country to assist the right hon. leader of the Government in his electioneering campaign, he ought to pay his own expenses. Altogether