

have so far been unable to ascertain what the country has lost by the cancellation of the contract for the Georgian Bay Branch. It is worthy of remark that the wisdom of the policy of the late Government, adopted in 1874, of establishing a port on the Georgian Bay, preparatory to the construction of the main line north of Lake Superior, is now being demonstrated by the policy of the Syndicate and the present Government; for, if rumor be correct, they have adopted a similar policy by establishing a Georgian Bay port at Algoma Mills, west of French River. I think they might as well have continued the Georgian Bay Branch to French River, which would have served the same purpose that is now being contemplated, and at the same time have saved the loss which took place on the contract. Considerable money has been expended on actual work on the road, and a great many people have suffered disappointment and actual loss by moving into the territory south of Lake Nipissing after the road commenced only to find their hopes blasted by the cancellation of the contract after the change of Government. It seems to be a settled fact that the party now in power are determined not to have the railway built south of Lake Nipissing on any condition whatever.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL VISITS TO ENGLAND.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving for a return shewing the expenses in detail incurred by the several members of the Government, and any other person or persons in the service of the Government, or paid by the Government, sent to England or elsewhere, on behalf of the Government, or in the service of the Government, from the 10th February, 1880, to date, said: I draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the observations which I made the other day on this subject. On the 23rd of February, 1880, I moved a similar motion to this, and on the 7th of March, 1881, the hon. gentleman submitted the return. Surely the hon. gentleman has employes enough in his Department to enable him to prepare such a return in a shorter period than thirteen months, and it is simply a farce for Parliament to order such returns if so long a time is required to execute his orders. On the 16th of December, 1880, I made a similar motion, and I find that the return was only brought down to-day—some fourteen months after the motion was made. On the same principle I suppose I may indulge the hope that the return now asked for will be forthcoming some time in 1883 or 1884. Moreover, the return the hon. gentleman has brought down is not in accordance with the Order of the House, which was for the accounts in detail and not in a lump sum. For instance, on one occasion, Sir Leonard Tilley's expenses to England were some \$800, and on another occasion some \$2,400. One would like to have some information on this discrepancy.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say that that return has been made in the same form as all such returns for the last ten years. I am not aware that any detailed statement has ever been made by any hon. member of a Government as to the number of meals he had, and as to his hotel and various other expenses. I know some delay took place last year, because part of the payments that had been made were for expenses incurred by agents in England, and they did not appear until the accounts for the year had come in. The discrepancy in the two sums mentioned by the hon. gentleman is chiefly owing to the fact that a portion of the \$2,400 was incurred on the first visit in 1878, but did not appear in the accounts until the next year, if my memory serves me. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has called attention to this matter, because the expenses of the two visits will compare very favorably with some others, I think. On the second visit, when I went to England to negotiate a loan, and in company with my colleagues to

discuss other questions, my secretary accompanied me, and his expenses are added. Information is now in the Department which will enable me to furnish, in a few days, what the hon. gentleman asks for in the Address.

Motion agreed to.

PASPÉBIAC HARBOUR.

Mr. BEAUCHESNE moved for copies of the report of the engineer who made the survey of the harbour of Paspébiac in 1874 and 1875.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any such report exists in any department; if a report has been made, it is one concerning the Intercolonial Railway. The motion may, however, pass. I shall make enquiries as to whether such a report exists, and if so, it shall be presented to the House.

Motion agreed to.

LAND GRANT BONDS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for all correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council in relation to the acceptance of the land grant bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the Government for any public purpose, and a statement of the action thereon, said: I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that it is stated in a prospectus of the Company that those land grant bonds had been ordered to be accepted in respect of certain other public purposes than security for the construction of the railway itself.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CONTRACT RIGHTS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence on the subject of any railway or projected railway claimed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to be in derogation of their contract rights, said: If the ordinary sources of information are correct, there is more than one railway in respect to which there ought to be an answer to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

EXTRADITION.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence not already brought down, as to extradition, and as to the last Canadian Extradition Act, and as to the address of both Houses of the Canadian Parliament on the subject, said: I desire to call the attention of the Government and the House very briefly to the present position of this question with a view to obtain an early answer to this address. I think it is now two years ago since I proposed an address to the Imperial Government requesting their attention to the joint address unanimously passed by both Houses of this Parliament, so long ago as 1877, asking for certain executive action which was necessary in order that our Extradition Act of 1877, which also passed unanimously, might become efficacious within this country. To that joint address no response has been brought down to Parliament, and my motion lapsed at the request of the hon. the First Minister, who informed me that he was on the point, as he expected, of being able to make satisfactory arrangements; and it was not renewed last Session, owing to the circumstances which pre-occupied the attention of the House. It is extremely unfortunate—I do not blame the Government at all, because we have not any materials for judging of their action—that there should have been no action as yet taken in reference to the Act of Parliament which was so passed, as it would have removed very many of the evils and difficulties which now exist in the working