many of which most of us, I suppose, never heard before. Nobody can doubt that this was not wanted in the public interest, and nobody can doubt that the hon. Minister knew that it was not wanted in the public interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We heard a great deal for and against the regulations for the settlement of the public lands, and I think it was well that the people should be fully informed in all localities of the country, even at the expense the hon. gentleman has mentioned, of the nature of these regulations, because immigration to the North-West comes from all parts of the Dominion. I think hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, spent, and properly spent, a considerable sum in the way of advertising. If I am not mistaken, the present Minister of Railways, on taking office, had to pay out sums to the extent of $10,000 for advertising in that department for the previous six months under his predecessor. If we compare the cost of advertising, I think hon. gentlemen opposite will be found to have been as anxious in disseminating information as the present Government. I must say, however, that there ought to be a very considerable check put upon indiscriminate advertising, and we shall endeavor, prompted by the precept, if not the example of hon. gentlemen opposite, to try and keep down the cost of advertising in the future.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Public Accounts, he will find that there was not, in the year 1878, $500 spent in advertising in connection with the Department of the Interior. Under the provisions of that law we were required to advertise the claims of various parties before the Commissioner undertook to deal with them. For this, I think, some $12,000 or $14,000 were paid. Those advertisements required to be inserted in the daily papers of Winnipeg for three months before action could be taken. Apart from that, you will not find $500 spent for advertising in two years. There is no necessity for it.

Mr. BOWELL. Let the hon. gentleman put a notice on the paper asking for a comparative statement, and he will find the comparison is not to the advantage of the late Government. As for my own department, I have scarcely got through paying the old accounts yet, running in cases of some papers for useless advertisements to the tune of $500 or $600 each.

Mr. MILLS. The advertisements may have appeared without orders from the department, and the hon. gentleman may be paying for advertising gratuitously done.

Mr. BOWELL. I have refused most distinctly to pay accounts unless certified to by the Queen's Printer, and when the Queen's Printer refused, the late Minister certified to them as having been ordered by himself. I did not consider myself justified in refusing an order of that kind, though the order was in direct opposition to the Order in Council passed by the Government of which he was a member.

Mr. CHARLTON. While upon the subject of Dominion lands, I wish to call attention to some matters in connection with Ordnance lands. We have not the report of the hon. Minister of the Interior this year, but I see that the arrears for payment of balance due for rent and instalments are very large and are increasing yearly. On the 30th June, 1875, the balance of rent unpaid was $25,755.29, and instalments and interest unpaid amounted to $20,440.75, a total of $46,196.02; the next year the arrears from both of those sources had run up to $47,003.87; on 30th June, 1877, they reached $53,844.48; the 30th June, 1878, $86,915.55; and the 30th June, 1879, the amount reached $107,368. It would be interesting to know how much was due last year. I think these accounts ought to be collected better than they are. I find from the last report that at Fort Erie $10,489.76 is due for rent and interest unpaid on 30th June, 1879, and the amount received was but $30.66. In the same year the amount due for interest and rent on Ordnance lands sold in Toronto is $1,534.80, and for instalments unpaid, $3,556.35; against which but $405.11 was received. Some change should be made in conducting this business. It is quite evident that political pressure is brought to bear on the hon. Minister of Interior by hon. members whose constituents are indebted to this fund. It is very natural, therefore, that these accounts should fall into arrears. I throw no blame on one Government more than another. The system is evidently defective. I suggest that this matter should be placed in some other hands, say in the hands of a commission entirely independent of political influence, who would deal with it in a business-like way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite correct. There has been great laxity in collecting the rents. Colonel Coffin, when in charge, was a very active officer who did his duty to the utmost extent, but was stopped by influence of some kind or other. There has been, especially in this vicinity, a very considerable lack of due pressure to collect dues of every kind. We are endeavoring to work up the collection as much as possible. The system has lasted so long that you cannot well come down with the hammer of Thor and crush all those people who have been allowed very laxly to run in arrears, but pressure will be brought on them to make them pay up.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that in Ottawa, the rents and interest remaining due and unpaid are over 18,000, while the instalments unpaid amount to but $7,000. I do not know how much is interest and how much rent, but allowing an equal amount for each, you have an enormous arrear of rent. It would be better for the Government to put this property up at the hammer and collect the purchase money from the purchasers. There is a total of $50,000 rent and interest in arrears, and the whole amount due is $194,000.

Mr. MILLS. A large part of the Government property in the city is held under perpetual leases. Those should be converted into freeholds, and the capitalized sum charged to the parties instead of yearly rental.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. During the last five years the depression in Ottawa was severely felt, and it would have been useless to put the property in the market, and you could not have converted the leases into freeholds. Now that the depression is over more active steps will be taken. Now, especially in this part of the country, there is no reason why those arrears should not be collected. I agree with the hon. gentleman, that whenever you can get rid of the property you should. We should endeavor to dispose of this property as fast as possible, consistent with the rights of the parties.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). What policy do you propose in connection with the Ordnance lands in Shelburne? Shortly before the retirement of the late Government, I made application on behalf of a gentleman who held Walter's Island, in the harbor of Shelburne, under an old lease from the British Government. The Minister of that day (the member for Bothwell) reported it had been decided the island should be sold to this gentleman, Mr. Willet, for $300, which he paid to the Receiver-General. Since I have made repeated applications to the Minister of the Department on Mr. Willet's account, whether his money would be accepted and a title for the island given, or his money refunded? Is the right hon. gentleman prepared to give an answer now or let the matter go on from year to year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to give an answer now, but shall inquire into the matter with a view to an early reply.

Mr. MILLS. When I was Minister of the Interior, I referred the matter to Col. Coffin, who reported that the