

be stated at the time and the return should be refused, but if it is agreed that the return should be brought down, then that agreement should be strictly kept and I do not know yet that that is not the intention. Certainly I have no reason to suppose that the government did not intend to comply with the motion to which they assented. I may say to my hon. friend that I also agree with the observations that were addressed by the hon. Secretary of State to the hon. gentleman at the time to which he refers—that our predecessors in this regard were very frequent sinners, and it is a case in which we should avoid walking in the footsteps of those who preceded us.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—I am in the same box with my leader in the fact that I moved for a return at the very commencement of the session last year, and although the hon. Secretary of State again and again promised to produce it shortly, we were left to the end of the session without having received it. He led us to understand at one time that a large portion of the return had been made up, and that he would turnish us with an instalment of it, and I think on one occasion I agreed to accept an instalment on account, because it was all I could get, apparently. But we did not get any part of it at all, not even the instalment. I hope the remarks which the leader of the House has made with reference to the returns asked for by the leader of the opposition will be extended so as to apply to my motion as well.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think the return moved for by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat was to be included in the return asked for by the leader of the opposition.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—No, it was a separate motion.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I thought it was the same information.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—No, quite different.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—All I can say is that the requests were made on the departments at the time, and repeated frequently since, and personal letters written to the ministers calling their attention to the importance of

complying with the order of the House, because it necessarily is very embarrassing to be placed in the position of not complying with an order passed by the House. A portion of the return asked for by the leader of the opposition was completed. That may possibly also have been the case with the return asked for by the hon. gentleman from Brandon, but I understood from the leader of the opposition that it was not desirable to bring down fragmentary returns. I think they are all in except from two departments—the Department of Railways and the Post Office Department.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I think that was the last announcement.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Those two departments are the defaulters.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—That was the understanding with the hon. leader of the opposition, but on the principle that half a loaf was better than no bread at all, I desired to have an instalment of the return that I had asked for if I could get it.

The Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, 8th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eight o'Clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

NEW SENATOR.

The Honourable WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN was introduced and took his seat.

EXAMINATION OF YUKON ROUTE.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON rose to call the attention of the Senate to the following telegram which appeared in the *Montreal Star* of the 8th of December last:—

VANCOUVER, B. C.—Messrs. Corthew and Wilkinson have returned from the Yukon. They went there for the Canadian government to locate an all-Canadian route. Their official report is not yet out, but it is a foregone conclusion that their route will be chosen. It starts at Ketimat from an inlet on the