

April 29, 1874

Mr. De COSMOS moved for the report of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs for British Columbia for 1873, and copies of all papers, including a statement of expenditure and correspondence connected with the Indian affairs of the said Province for 1873. He said that in the report of the Minister of the Interior very little information was given on the subject. He observed that a very small amount of money had been expended among the Indian population in British Columbia, while a very large amount had been expended in the Northwest Territories. He did not wish a large amount of money to be spent anywhere, as economy ought to be the order of the day, but the Indian tribes of British Columbia thought they were treated unfairly.

He moved also for a return showing who recommended the appointment of Mr. Lenihan to the office of Assistant Indian Commissioner in the said Province and why and where he was appointed, and whether he had any experience in the management of Indian affairs before his appointment, and what salary and allowances have been granted him.

He was opposed to the sending of men to British Columbia to fill offices when they had men in the Province better able to discharge the duties.

The motion was carried.

* * *

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. De COSMOS moved that a respectful address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that a return be laid before this House respecting the Province of British Columbia, showing the debt and revenue of the province for the year commencing on July 20, 1871, and ending June 30, 1872; also a return for the year commencing July 1, 1872, and ending June 30, 1873, and also an approximate return for the half year commencing July 1, 1873, and ending December 31, 1873. He asked for a return showing:

1. The public debt taken over or payable by the Dominion for each year respectively.
2. The interest on such public debt.
3. The sinking fund on the same.
4. The respective subsidy paid to the Province.
5. The total revenue collected, showing the sources.
6. The total sum voted, showing the respective votes, whether in the annual estimates or provided by statute.
7. The total amount expended, showing the expenditure under each departmental head.
8. The total amount voted, but not expended, under each departmental head.
9. The total amount expended in excess of votes, showing excess over the respective votes under each departmental head.

10. The total amount expended less than the votes under each departmental head.

11. The total amount expended by each Department without a Parliamentary vote.

12. Whether the amount expended was less than the total revenue collected in the Province, and if so, how much.

13. Whether the total amount expended was more than the receipts, and how much.

14. Total value of imports.

15. Total value of exports.

16. Estimated actual population.

17. Rate per head of imports for home consumption.

18. The rate per head of imports of Canadian produce and manufacture.

19. The rate per head of export of Provincial produce or manufacture.

20. The rate per head of exports of foreign merchandise.

21. The rate per head of taxes derived and interest paid to the Dominion.

22. The amount expended for the Canadian Pacific Railway, under a distinct head.

He believed that in future it would be found that the Dominion of Canada had secured a very fine bargain in obtaining British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT promised to bring down all possible information which he could afford.

The motion was carried.

* * *

PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex West) moved the adoption of the second report of the select committee on the petitions for a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

He expressed his regret at the retirement of **Mr. BODWELL** from Parliament.

He urged that, as was set forth in the report, the feeling in favour of a Prohibitory Liquor Law was widespread. Indeed last year the petitions were signed by 30,000 people, as well as by the heads of corporations representing 160,895 individuals. This year, up to Saturday last, the petitions on this behalf had contained 77,252 signatures, and those from corporations had represented 362,135 people. There had also been a petition unanimously signed by the Legislature of New Brunswick.

It had been said that these petitions were signed by minors, but he held that the fact of these parties desiring the protection of the law gave additional weight to the prayer of the petitioners. It had been said that the passage of a prohibitory law would make a