

On the item of \$4,000 for salaries, &c., of Indian Commissioners for the Northwest,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked for the details of this, the Finance Minister having promised to furnish them.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS did not remember having made such a promise. The amount was so small that he really did not think it necessary to furnish details.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE thought it very strange if they could not know for instance the salary of the Commissioner.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS: The salary is \$2,000.

The item was concurred in.

On the item of \$20,000 for expenses connected with Indians in British Columbia,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked what was to be done with this money. He did not see why the Indians required protection.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD owing to the absence of the Minister charged with this matter, said an explanation could not be given just now. He believed it was to carry out an arrangement entered into with the Indians by the Local Government of British Columbia.

The item was concurred in.

On the item of \$50,000 for cost connected with surveys of the boundary line between Canada and the United States in the North West,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked what was the position of this matter.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said that arrangements had been made with the Government of the United States more than a year ago, but the matter had been delayed from some mistake in voting the amount in Congress. The matter had since however, been rectified, and correspondence was going on as to the formation of the Commission.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE had seen it stated that the American Government were assuming their view of the boundary, and directing their surveys accordingly.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the line had been taken merely as a matter of convenience. It would be subject to the report of the Commission.

On the item for contingencies, &c., Welland Canal,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE quoted from a newspaper to the effect that the contract for the supply of timber on the canal had been given to one John Macdonald, of Thorold, whose tender was much higher than those of others. He asked if there was any truth in this statement.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the hon. gentleman should have given him notice of his question, as from the numerous works connected with his department, he could not remember every item. He would say, however, that the whole transaction would be found to be perfectly clear, and that the first tender had been accepted. He would give further information to-morrow.

Mr. STREET said the paper quoted by the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had accused him (Mr. Street) of using his influence in connection with this contract, and he would take this occasion to deny publicly that there was any truth in the accusation.

The item was concurred in.

On the item of \$17,000, balance on Nova Scotia buildings,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked whether this was intended to cover interest upon the sum, and whether it was the intention to allow to Nova Scotia the sum withheld on account of interest due on those buildings.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the amount proposed was exactly the award of the arbitrators. The arbitrators had not awarded that the amount that had been withheld should be repaid, and the Government did not intend to repay it.

The item was passed.

On the item of \$20,000 additional for working expenses on the European and North American Railway, in reply to Hon. Mr. Anglin,

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that this was on account of the very severe winter.

The item was concurred in.

On the item for archives, in reply to Hon. Mr. Mackenzie,

Hon. Mr. POPE explained that this had been put in at the suggestion of the Committee, which had met here last year. It was for the purpose of providing for the protection of old historical documents, which it was important should be preserved.

The item was concurred in.

On the item of \$10,000 improvements to Kingston harbour,

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN asked if an estimate had been made, and how the money was proposed to be expended.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked if the local authorities were to expend an equal sum as was the case at Collingwood.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN explained that at Collingwood the Northern Railway Company expended an equal sum to that expended by the Government, but Kingston harbour was regarded as a part of the canal system, in consequence of vessels passing through the canals being transhipped at that port.