strong connection between the price to be obtained for Canadian 4 per cents. and the price to be obtained for American 4½ per cents. As to the other point which he raises, I admit frankly that it is a point for mature consideration. I am not pressing upon the hon. Minister to act contrary to his own judgment, but I am pointing out one or two reasons why, in my opinion, it is advisable even to lose a point or two rather than to go on paying a large additional sum every year—4½ per cent., as far as we are concerned, instead of 4 per cent. Of course, he must do exactly as he decides. It is for him to weigh the various difficulties in the way of negotiating loans, and for him to decide. That is his business. My business, however, is to call his attention and that of the House to the fact that our Sinking Fund is larger than, I think, that of any other State of similar size at the present moment. He may be aware—I am not—of a State with an equal amount of securities on the market, that has an equally large Sinking Fund, and he must see that using this $1,250,000, which will go on increasing all the time, in this way, is not a very desirable thing. I am not proposing to abolish the Sinking Fund altogether, even if it were possible. He cannot do that. He is bound to go on with the Sinking Fund in the majority of these loans up to 1894 or 1895, I think. What I say is, the Sinking Fund which will be at his disposal, under present arrangements, is so large, that it would be wise for him not to add to it, and to endure even a slight loss—and I believe it would be a very slight loss, if any at all—in consequence.

Mr. HESSON. This is the first time I ever heard objection being taken to securities being strengthened by a Sinking Fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you know very little about it.

Mr. HESSON. I think I have had as much experience in regard to Sinking Funds as the ex-Finance Minister, perhaps not in a large way, but in a small way, and we must judge from experience. We know, that if you put securities into the market without any provision for a Sinking Fund, you will not get as good a price as if there was such a provision. I do not think it is any mistake for the Government to invest in their own securities. It is simply retiring their own securities every year to a certain extent, and it strengthens the value of their securities abroad. I think the hon. gentleman established a very good precedent when he established that, and perhaps under more trying circumstances than the country is now called upon to pass through. I think it would be unwise to abandon a policy which has been found to answer so well in municipalities, where I think they manage these things as carefully as anywhere else.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to differ with my hon. and experienced friend, but I will say this—he will understand it is not a question of dispensing with the Sinking Fund altogether. Under our arrangements, a very large Sinking Fund indeed will be applied to the payment of our securities for the next twenty-four or twenty-five years. I have very great doubts whether, in our position, a Sinking Fund is any longer wanted, and I have very great doubts whether it would add to any appreciable extent to the price we would get, while it undoubtedly will add to the burdens of the people of this country, because he must remember that every dollar unnecessarily taken from the people involves a greater loss than is represented by every dollar that goes into the Treasury. But we are not discussing the question of abolishing the Sinking Fund. For the next generation, at all events, we will have always a large Sinking Fund, which will go on increasing. It goes into an accumulated fund, and the interest is always added, and I say that, as it stands, is quite enough, and there is no need to add to it any further. I found the Sinking Fund increasing more than I thought desirable, and I did not hesitate to state to the Minister of Finance that I had determined myself and would have supported him, in 1880, or in 1879, if he had pleased, in dispensing with the Sinking Fund from that time out. I admit there is something to be said on both sides, but I think the advantages of the Sinking Fund are outweighed by the additional burden on the people, especially as we will not dispense with the Sinking Fund or a million and more applicable to it for many years.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

?. The Governor General's Secretary's Office..... $9,710 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is an annual increase to one messenger, $30; there is a decrease in the third class clerks of $100, and an increase of $50 to the chief clerk—on the whole a decrease of about $20, if you deduct the amount of appropriation last year to C. C. Jones, made under peculiar circumstances. The law provides that in the absence of an official, a chief clerk, for instance, the next on the list discharges the duties and receives the salary. In this case the chief clerk, a Mr. Stewart, died, and the Act does not provide for that, and we took a vote of $145 to pay him the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose these $3,000 are distributed for *Aides-de-camp* at the pleasure of His Excellency.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A question was raised, I think it was last year, whether it would not be advisable to have a gentleman born, or at least brought up, in Canada attached as one of these *Aides-de-camp*. There is a good deal to be said for that, in my opinion, although, of course, it is also very proper that His Excellency should have with him such officers as he may please to bring.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not recollect any reference being made to that subject last year, but there is a good deal in what the hon. member says. Of course, the Governor General's wishes must be considered in the matter. But while there is a good deal to be said in favour of the appointment of a Canadian, still I do not think that it should be laid down as a fixed rule.

Mr. BLAKE. I was going to say something to the same effect. Of course, His Excellency's *Aides-de-camp* are a part of his family, and it is very reasonable and natural that he should have the selection of them, but I have no doubt that his own comfort and the efficiency of his office, in some not unimportant respects, would be greatly promoted if we were to recur to the old system. In the old Province of Canada we had a Provincial *Aides-de-camp*, and I have no doubt whatever, that a native officer who was thoroughly acquainted with the people of the country, and could teach the new comers of the Staff, and inform those in authority on many important points, would be very conducive to the easy working of the office. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the suggestion is one of no little practical moment. It is no new thing. In the old Province of Canada we had a Provincial *Aides-de-camp* who filled the post for very many years, who was a man of great discretion and judgment, and was found extremely useful to the successive incumbents to the high office of Governor General—our old friend Col. Irvine. I think the sooner we recur to that plan the better it will be to the office.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In many of the Provinces, before Confederation, we had a gentleman filling that situation. In New Brunswick, there was an officer holding the position for over twenty years. There is a great advantage in it, as when a change in Governors General takes place, and a new Governor arrives, everything moves on as before,