

of the legal profession show for their clients.

Mr. FOSTER. Tempered, I suppose, in some slight degree, by the fees he receives.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In order to avoid any such suggestion as that made by the leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Justice has thought proper to continue the lawyers recently employed in the case, Mr. Christopher Robinson, Mr. Ritchie, and Mr. Coste, leaving them in absolute control of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very wise, because they were in it from the first.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that apply to the commission of interprovincial accounts only or does it apply to other questions between the provinces and the Dominion?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What other question?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that there was a question of Queen's Counsel.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has nothing to do with this question.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but I understood the Solicitor General to speak of all questions that have arisen between the provinces and the Dominion. Has the same policy been pursued in connection with this question of Queen's Counsel?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This matter of the appointment of Queen's Counsel is now on the verge of solution as between the provinces and the Dominion. There is a tentative proposal that both sides shall accept the suggestion of the Supreme Court in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I was wondering if the lawyers in the case on one side would turn around like the Minister of Justice and argue the other way. But the Minister of Finance I understood, proposed to give us some information with regard to the interprovincial accounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have a memorandum, but it does not contain very much in addition to what is already known. The memorandum which I have obtained in answer to my hon. friend's question, is that practically all matters in dispute between the Dominion and the provinces have been settled, with the exception of the following:—

I. The Common School Fund.—In regard to this, Ontario and Quebec have appealed from the awards made by the arbitrators, and the appeals are standing for argument before the Supreme Court of Canada.

II. The Robinson Treaties.—In regard to those, the decision of the arbitrators, in their award of the 13th February, 1895, that Ontario should be liable for payments made by the Dominion to the Indians, was set aside by a payment of the Judi-

cial Committee of the Privy Council, and, as a consequence of this latter payment, the matter has again been submitted to the arbitrators to determine whether Ontario and Quebec are not jointly liable for the payments.

III. Payments after Confederation.—The arbitrators have before them claims made by the Dominion against the old provinces of Canada for liabilities incurred and work done before confederation, but not paid for till after confederation. These claims amount to about \$60,000.

IV. Treaty No. 3.—There is also a claim before the arbitrators against Ontario for expenditures made by the Dominion in connection with Indian Treaty No. 3.

Practically, however, the matter has not made very much progress since the date of the public accounts.

Mr. MACLEAN. I hope that in this matter the Solicitor General will give not only his passive support but his active support in maintaining the Dominion view on all these questions, especially in view of the fact that the Government is now largely made up of ex-provincial premiers who declared when they were at the head of their respective provincial governments that they proposed to vindicate the rights of their provinces and get as much of this money in dispute as they could. Now, I trust they will take the federal view, and not only in a passive way, as the Solicitor General stated, but in a most active way, vindicate the Dominion's rights on these questions.

Defence of Esquimalt, B.C.—

Dominion contribution towards expenditure for works and buildings.....	\$24,000
Pay and allowance of a detachment of Royal Marine Artillery or Royal Engineers.....	42,500
	\$76,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that item the amount is correct, but the division of the item is incorrect. I propose to change the division—of course without changing the total, which we cannot change. I move that the item read \$29,000 and \$47,500, and that would not affect the total.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we able to do that? We are not dividing, in a sense, the total amount, but we have the item given to us in two parts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At first I had, myself, some doubt, but after looking closely into it, I see it is not a division that ought to be objected to, because it is for the same purpose, simply two items of the same purpose, for the defence of Esquimalt—that is the purpose. I am informed it is the practice of the House that where we do not change the amount of the item, the division can be made.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another little peculiarity in this. Stripped of all its explanatory part, the vote could run, "defence of Esquimalt, \$76,500."