

of mineral lands other than coal, with the royalties from the minerals, between the 1st January 1883, and the 31st December, 1891, both inclusive,"—

Mark you the precision of detail. The 1st of January and the 31st December, were both included in the calculation—

"will amount to not less than \$58,000,000.

"A. M. BURGESS."

That, Sir, is testimony which makes me feel happy under the most desperate circumstances. We are sorry to observe that the receipts from Dominion lands this year do not quite come up to the proportion. In fact, I am not aware of any particular year in which they may be said to have reached those figures. But doubtless the hon. gentleman was just stooping to conquer. He was withdrawing only to make the better leap, and what little has been done in the way of permitting arrears to accumulate in the North-West lands will be made good; the assurance given to Parliament by the Ministry will be implemented, and our debts will not only be paid but we will have a handsome revenue from the sale of North-West lands—between the 1st of January, 1883, and the 31st December, 1891, "both inclusive." But while I feel thus assured as to the West, while I stick to my text and insist on its accuracy in spite of all difficulties, I am not so certain about the Eastern part of our expenditure. One of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House—in fact both of them—alluded to the East. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau) said something about one East and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) said something about another farther East, and it seems we have not received any assurance or statement as yet as to the effects of the policy of last Session in the East. What of the Short Line route? What of the Bill of last Session for reaching the city of Quebec? As to the arrangement for reaching that city, one alternative of that arrangement was to take effect, if at all, within six months after the passing of the Act; the other within twelve months. I do not know whether the fatal hour has struck, but at any rate it approaches very nearly, and we begin to be anxious about the arrangement in that regard. As to the route of the Short Line we really thought last Session that we had something to say about it. Some of us were audacious enough to suggest that the people's representatives should have an opportunity of deciding whether the view of the Government, after receiving the report of a competent engineer, was good or not, and that the route should not be finally fixed by executive action. We were pooh-poohed. My hon. friend who sits close to me tested the sense of the House on that view, but his motion was denied, the Government resisting it, and we were refused the opportunity. But I see something in the newspapers, which always are accurate, that seems to indicate that after all my hon. friend was not so far wrong. I see that something was said by the First Minister, and corroborated by the Minister of Public Works—as if the statement required corroboration—in the city of Three Rivers, in the county which he so ably represents, indicating that we were to see the surveys, that we were to have some opportunity of dealing with the selection of the route. Clearly then the decision which was reached last Session was a wrong decision under the circumstances. To what do we owe this new light on the part of the hon. gentleman? Was it to reconcile his supporters, or what, that, having us completely in his hands, having procured from this confiding Parliament the consent that he asked for, he should now say that he will be gracious enough to permit us to do our duty in the matter? From the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) we learned that nothing has been done in the far East, and that the counties of Cumberland and Fictou are in a sad condition by reason of that failure. Now that surprises me. I begin to lose faith in assurances, however plausible. I had

myself doubts about this matter; I expressed them frankly as I always do. I questioned the hon. gentleman's predecessor, the late hon. Minister of Railways, as to whether he had satisfied himself that the companies were all right, that they were solvent, that the matter was *bonâ fide*, and the Minister of Railways assured me, with every positiveness, that it was all right, that he had satisfied himself as to the *bonâ fides* and good standing of the corporations, and that everything was going through. Now, the hon. gentleman from Cumberland says that his predecessor was all wrong. He assures me that nothing—no, that some small work has been done, which has not been paid for, and that the poor laborers lack, and the store keepers lack, and they call on the Government whom they have faithfully supported in two elections, notwithstanding the offer held out to them of a railway through the country—they call on the faithful Government to pay these debts and procure the construction of this railway. And has it not gone to Cape Breton either? We had a positive assurance on that point, too. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) declared that he thought that the amount was too small, and I was obliged to say to him that the Minister of Railways had told us it was enough and that the work was going to be done; that if we wanted more money to spend on railways we should spend it where it was wanted, but not to ask us to take more money out of the Treasury than was needed to secure the railway. Is the hon. gentleman serious in saying that no arrangement has been made for the building of that railway? Whom shall I believe? As to the Manitoba settlement, I am glad to hear that there has been another final settlement in that Province. But I want to know if it is final for this year, or really finally final. There are some things which it is utterly impossible to settle finally. You cannot provide finally with reference to that Province on the population basis. And with regard to that question, I suggested, two or three years ago, that there should be more frequent censuses to regulate the adjustment of the population subsidy to that Province. But, apart from that, there was no reason why these matters should not have been settled once for all. I see, however, that the hon. gentleman declares that we shall have a Bill to confirm the settlement as soon as the Local Legislature has accepted it. Therefore, I presume that the Province will be called upon to deal with the matter in the first place, and I am not called upon to pronounce upon the merits of this settlement until the details shall be laid before us. But I am very glad to see that the hon. gentleman has succeeded again in conciliating his stern opponent, the Premier of that Province, and actually capturing his confidence. We are treated with the statement, for the third time repeated, that we are to have a Representation Bill, and I suppose the third time is the charm, because twice before we have had it up to a certain point, but no farther. I trust, however, that as the story goes that this is to be a very short Session, the hon. gentleman will have reconsidered the provisions of that measure as introduced on two former occasions, and that he will have taken heed to the objections rather suggested than elaborated; because it was not proper that the measure should have been fully discussed until the hon. gentleman opened that discussion by an expository speech in introducing the measure, which he has never yet made, and that the measure introduced will be more satisfactory than the former one was. For my part, I declare my unswerving adhesion to the view, notwithstanding the statements of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this occasion, that simplicity, economy, convenience and the public welfare are to be served most by our adopting, until there is some good reason given to the contrary, the franchises of the Local Legislatures. I shall not anticipate that question, but I maintain further that a measure which proposes, as the former measures of the hon. gentlemen