

Sometimes an emigrant to this country gets well off in a few years, and sends money home to his poor relations, it may be a pound note, a ten pound note, or a twenty pound note. Sometimes he may want to send money home to bring out his family. But I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that we cannot exchange money orders with the old country as cheaply as we can to the United States. I find that the rates for sending money orders to those two countries are as follows:—

Amount.	Cost to Great Britain.	Cost to United States.
\$10 00	\$0 20	\$0 10
20 00	0 40	0 20
40 00	0 80	0 40
50 00	1 00	0 50

Now, I think it would be a great advantage to a great many people if they could send money as cheaply to the United Kingdom as they can to the United States, because it would be an additional inducement for people to send money to the old country, and for people of the old country to send money here. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to this fact. In Great Britain they are talking about reducing the rates to this country, and the present would be a favorable opportunity for our Government to act in unison with the British Government in the direction I have indicated. I trust the Government will look into this matter with the view of reducing the rates, and thus confer a great advantage upon the people of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE BOXES.

Mr. COURSOL, in moving for a statement showing the number of boxes, drawers and pigeon-holes in the Montreal Post Office; the number of boxes, drawers and pigeon-holes not let before the rent was raised, and the number of those not let since the rent was so raised, said: My object in making this motion is to ascertain whether the Post Office Department have acted wisely in increasing the price of boxes in the Montreal Post Office. The price of boxes and pigeon-holes was first increased from \$1.50 to \$2.50, and afterwards to \$4; and the price of drawers, which at first was \$2, was raised to \$4, and is now \$6. If the effect of these changes has been to diminish the number of boxes let, as well as the revenue collected by the department, the policy has been a mistake, injuring the city of Montreal without benefitting the Dominion. The city of Montreal is indebted to the Federal Government for the erection of a magnificent post office, but I am credibly informed that in many cases the high price of the boxes has induced citizens to abandon them and depend on the letter-carriers. Complaints on this subject are frequently made, and I believe that since the 1st of January a smaller number of boxes were let than when the prices were lower.

Mr. LANGEVIN. The statement the hon. gentleman moves for will, of course, be brought down. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that there was no intention of injuring the citizens of Montreal in any way. Should the system be found not to work well, the Post Office Department will be disposed to do the right thing. When the statement comes down the hon. gentleman will be in a position to confer on the subject with the Postmaster General, who will always be happy to hear him.

Motion agreed to.

THE ESTIMATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY, in reply to Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, stated that the Estimates would be laid on the Table to-morrow, and that he hoped to be able to make his financial statement on Friday.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for returns were severally agreed to:—

(1.) Copies of all tenders transmitted to the Government for the telegraph posts to be distributed on the Island of Anticosti, the Magdalen Islands, and on that portion of the north shore of the St. Lawrence included in the map submitted to the Government, with a view to show the advantage of connecting, by means of a submarine cable, that portion of the north shore and the said islands with the telegraph lines on the south shore. (2.) A statement showing the price or prices asked by each party tendering for a part or the whole of the contract. (3.) The names of the persons to whom a contract or contracts were awarded and the prices at which such contracts were awarded.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Return showing the claims of contractors and others, arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railroad, which have been made or reported upon since the report dated November 27th, 1880, made by F. Shanly, Esq., Chief Engineer Intercolonial Railway, the names of the claimants, the amount claimed, the nature of the claims, the report, if any made, and the amount paid or to be paid in each case.—(Mr. Anglin.)

Return stating in detail the names of the several persons to whom was paid the sum of \$23,931, given in page 10 of the report of the Minister of Railways for the year ending June 30th, 1880, as the total sum paid for "construction of railways, old accounts" and charged to expenditure on capital account, the amount claimed and the amount paid in each case, and the report on which payment was made.—(Mr. Anglin.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th February, 1881.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RICHELIEU ELECTION PETITION.

Mr. SPEAKER said: After having given a most careful consideration to the petition of Edmund Ritter, and others of Sorel, representing that there has been a failure of justice in the matter of the trial of the election petition complaining of an undue return for the electoral division of Richelieu, and praying to be allowed to make proof before this House of the allegation therein made, I am of opinion that the same cannot be properly received, for reasons which I now propose to state. The petition sets forth, that on the 4th November, 1878, a petition was filed in pursuance of the Statute in the Superior Court at Sorel, by two duly qualified electors, contesting the election of the member elect for Richelieu for corrupt practices by himself and agents. Later in the same month a counter-petition was filed by the member elect against Mr. Barthe, his opponent at the said election. On the day appointed for the trial, Mr. Justice Gill dismissed the two petitions for want of proof. His judgment, declaring the sitting member duly elected, was forwarded to this House, in accordance with the law governing such matters, and was recorded in the Journals. The present petitioners now allege that the trial was not brought to issue in good faith, but that it was conducted collusively with the view of presenting any full