

of necessity, in the slightest degree, but of choice, in which you conjoin the office of a Minister whose duties call him to be in Ottawa, with the office of High Commissioner, whose duties call him to be in London. That is an arrangement, not of a necessary and temporary character, but of choice—the permanent conjunction of two inconsistent and incompatible offices. Then, the hon. gentleman says there is nothing at all in the objection that the High Commissioner is under the control of the Minister of Agriculture, *quoad* his duties in regard to immigration. Why, he says Lord Spelcer is under the control of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Well, we know there has been considerable discussion upon that subject. We know that the Chief Secretary for Ireland has not been, until late years, a member of the Cabinet, and therefore the Lord Lieutenant has been the chief Executive officer. We know that, in consequence of the extraordinary condition of affairs in Ireland, the Chief Secretary for Ireland was made a member of the Cabinet when Mr. Forster was made Chief Secretary; and we know that that condition of things, under which there was something like a co-ordinate authority between the Lord Lieutenant having a seat in the Cabinet as well as the Chief Secretary, has been the subject of considerable criticism. Some people have said that the divided authority was not quite the thing, and that there has been a considerable weakening of the Lord Lieutenant's authority. The experiment has been regarded as not altogether successful. But I do not think the analogy bears out. Here we have a statutory arrangement, under which the High Commissioner is under the control of the Minister of Agriculture. That is an entirely different thing from the arrangement, indefinite and elastic as it is, between the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The High Commissioner is an officer of the Minister of Agriculture. He is bound to obey that Minister's instructions; he is not a Cabinet Minister at all; but he reports to one of the Ministers. I say that the argument of my hon. friend has not been in the slightest degree attacked in that respect. Then the hon. gentleman says you are complaining that this arrangement is continued; but you ought to find out whether it is going to be continued or not before you express an opinion. How could we find out? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that he would answer the question, if we asked? We know that it is going to be continued; we know that it is continuing to-night; we know that it is to go on to-morrow; we know that it is to go on until the end of the Session; and we know that after the Session is over, the High Commissioner is to return to London, because the hon. Minister of Finance has told us that he is to go and continue his negotiations, and because the papers which have been laid on the Table shows that he is preparing his mansion not a mansion in the skies, of course, but a mansion in the fogs of London. Therefore, all the indices are quite sufficient to show that the arrangement is to be continued. But if the hon. gentleman informs us that it is to be discontinued, I shall advise my hon. friend to withdraw his motion; but if he cannot give us that assurance, I will advise my hon. friend to divide the House on the motion, because this arrangement, which was objectionable from the start, which has been demonstrated from its inception to be a wrong, is a wrong that is about to be continued, and that ought to be discontinued by the vote of this House.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mills,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Platt,
Béchar,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),

Mr. BLAKE.

Burpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cartwright,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Catudal,	Lister,	Vail,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McIntyre,	Wilson,—51.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Méhot,
Beaty,	Fortin,	Moffat,
Belleau,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Orton,
Billy,	Gordon,	Painat,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burnham,	Hay,	Ross,
Burns,	Hesson,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Small,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Smyth,
Caron,	Ives,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Temple,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tilley,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper (Pictou),
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Lesage,	Vanasse,
Outhbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Dauost,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Brackville),
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wood (Westland).—95.
Dugas,	McDougald,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Messieurs

Opposition.

Bain (Soulanges),
Massue,
Bergeron,
Benson,
Gault,
White (Hastings),
Barnard,
Abbott,

Scriver,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Cockburn,
Campbell (Renfrew),
Mulock,
Holton,
Yeo.

The House, then again, resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

RAILWAYS.

Canadian Pacific Railway.

68. Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River... \$500,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain to us in detail what he proposes to do with this \$500,000. I had supposed that, by his arrangement, this had all been finally handed over to the Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right, but he will understand that it requires the money to be provided to pay all the same, under the contract which has been made with the Company for the construction of the work that remained to be performed, between Prince Arthur's Landing and Red River. There is not only the section "B" to be finished, but there are the works that required to be completed under the previous contracts. This \$500,000 is required to settle the section "B" contract, and to provide for the payment to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for completing this section of road, as per the agreement which has been laid upon the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is about 100 miles, I think, is it not? The part that remains—how much is it?