

April 27, 1874

Lawrence Tow Boat Company he had been a stockholder in the said company.

**Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD** said that, inasmuch as this was an attack upon one of his former colleagues, who was absent, it became necessary for him to say something in his defence. He denied that at the time of the giving of the contract M. Langevin had been a stockholder in the St. Lawrence Tow Boat Company and produced an affidavit from Mr. Gaboury, Secretary of the Tow Boat Company, to that effect, adding that the contract was not with the Department of Public Works, but stating that it was with the Minister of Inland Revenue.

After some remarks from Mr. Fiset,

**Hon. Mr. BLAKE** said he had some little knowledge of the inconveniences which had been occasioned to the public by the St. Lawrence Tow Boat Company, who had a lease of the wharves, and charged a toll to all vehicles which came upon them, and if this were not paid the vehicles had to stay outside on the roads, to the detriment of the public convenience. This, he added, was exacted on the pretence of the money being expended on necessary repairs. He (**Hon. Mr. Blake**) thought that the Company had a very favourable contract, and should not attempt to exact more. He disapproved of the expenditure of public money by any Company, and said that repairs which were needed should not be done by the Company, but by the Government.

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE** and **Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD** objected to the last clause of the motion, as relating to **Hon. Mr. Langevin**.

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE** promised to bring down all the information legitimately procurable. He did not think that a general company of this kind should be entrusted with the expenditure of public money.

The resolution was then carried, the last part of the motion relating to **Hon. Mr. Langevin** having been expunged.

\* \* \*

#### NORTH HURON ELECTION

**Mr. FARROW** moved for an address to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of all correspondence between the Government and Mr. Thomas Holmes, Returning Officer for the North riding of Huron, relating to the last election in that riding for a member to serve in the House of Commons. He said that the partisan Returning Officer at the time of the election had caused certain persons in the Centre riding of Huron, of the village of Ainleyville, to vote in the North riding, so that 33 votes that had been polled against him were fraudulent. The Returning Officer had also changed the day of voting, and had stated that he had received written instructions to do so.

**Hon. Mr. DORION** said that there was no objection to the motion. The only correspondence was the circular which had been issued to all the Returning Officers.

**Mr. CAMERON (Huron South)** said that there was no more fit or more capable Returning Officer than Mr. Holmes. The village of Ainleyville was partly in one riding and partly in another, and he believed that if the Returning Officer had compelled all the people of Ainleyville to vote in the North riding he had done perfectly right, as the northern division was the least populated.

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE** and **Hon. Mr. BLAKE** denied that the Government had given any improper instructions, the only thing that had passed between them being a circular suggesting to returning officers the advisability of the voting taking place on one day throughout the Province.

**Mr. WHITE (Hastings East)** called the hon. gentleman to order, explaining that the only question before the House was whether the Government had instructed the returning officer to cause the votes from one riding to be polled in another.

**Hon. Mr. DORION** said that if the object of the hon. gentleman was to know whether any instructions had been given to Returning Officers to take the same vote, he could assure him that no such correspondence would be found in the Department. He thought he had better withdraw the motion.

The motion was then withdrawn.

\* \* \*

#### ESCHEATS AND FORFEITURES

**Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD** moved for a copy of an Act passed by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario at its last session, entitled "An Act to amend the law respecting escheats and forfeitures", together with all Orders in Council and all correspondence between the Governments of Canada and Ontario as to the said Act, or as to the matters affected by the said Act.

He said he had not seen the Act itself, and should defer any remarks until it was laid before the House. It appeared, however, that a portion of it was ultra vires, as to appealed-forfeitures for crimes, which could only be dealt with by this Parliament.

**Hon. Mr. DORION** said this question was one of great difficulty and was one which was attracting the attention of the Quebec Government. There was at present a question of jurisdiction whether or not escheats and forfeitures fell into the hands of the Dominion or those of the Provincial authorities. He said there had been no correspondence in respect to the Act. The matter was brought to his attention only a few days ago. He had not yet received the Act of the Ontario Parliament, but he had no objection to the motion passing. A similar case had occurred in Quebec, when a whole estate which had been escheated had been taken possession of.

**Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD** said he presumed that with respect to the law of escheats he had no doubt the Provincial legislature had the right of dealing, but the question of the respective right and jurisdiction might at any distant date arise, and with that view he had made this motion in order that the subject might have attention. He said he presumed the Provincial Legislatures had the right to deal with escheats as far as regarded