

effected through the influence of Dansereau with the Government, and that a considerable portion of the sum paid for the quarry in excess of the price at which it was offered to the Government by Auclair was intended to be used in the promotion of elections in the interest of the political party then supporting the Government."

He (Mr. Holton) did not intend to go any further into this matter than to call attention to the facts connected with it.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN wished to know why the hon. member tried to connect his (Mr. Langevin's) name with this transaction.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said it was because reference was made to the hon. gentleman in the evidence.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said there was malice in the hon. gentleman's attempt to represent him as being implicated in the matter. It was not in accordance with the evidence to say the quarry was offered to the Government for \$9,000. It never was communicated to them, and that fact changed the appearance of the matter altogether. The Government having been ignorant of any such offer, the course they pursued was perfectly right. If they had known it could be bought for \$9,000 they certainly would not have paid more for it. Experts were appointed to value the property, and the matter was regularly brought before Parliament. But this transaction had nothing to do with the question before the chair, and he hoped the House would not be diverted from it by the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON quoted from the evidence of Messrs. Moylan and Lemay to show that reference was made to the Hon. Mr. Langevin by them.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said this was brought up as a screen to the other matter. When he, a short time before, had brought to the notice of the Premier the fact that money had been squandered on public works on the Lower St. Lawrence, instead of imputing wrong motives to the Government, he merely directed attention to it. The Premier had thanked him for the manner in which it was referred to. He (Mr. Langevin) had been a Minister of the Crown himself, and he treated

hon. gentleman opposite as he desired to be treated himself.

Mr. DESJARDINS said the hon. member for Chateauguay had attempted to justify one wrong by another.

The matter then dropped.

RAILWAY LANDS IN VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. DECOSMOS asked:—Do the Government intend to surrender to British Columbia the belt of land reserved for Railway purposes on Vancouver Island, or do they intend to perfect their title and offer the same for sale in conformity with the Dominion Lands Acts?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—We do not pretend to have any claim to the land.

THE DEBT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. DECOSMOS asked:—Do the Government intend to carry out the agreement made in 1873 by and between the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada, respecting the advance by the latter to the former, of the difference between the actual and allowed debt of the said Province at the date of Union? And why did the Government refuse to carry out the said agreement in 1875?

Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT—The agreement made by the Government is defined very clearly in the Act of Parliament of 1874, for regulating the advances to all the Provinces. As to the second Branch of the hon. gentleman's question, the sum of \$189,000 was advanced to the Province of British Columbia, but it was not considered expedient to advance any further sum.

FISHERIES ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. POULIOT moved an Address to His Excellency the Governor General for a statement of the fishing licenses granted since Confederation for setting up fisheries on the beach of the St. Lawrence in front of the parishes of Notre Dome du Portage, River du Loup and Cacouna, shewing:—1st. The names of the persons to whom licenses were granted, together with the amount paid for each such license. 2nd. The amount of fines and penalties paid for infractions of the law in set