

\$360; making a total of \$11,519. Of course, there was no contingent account of \$167,000 to draw from, and there would be a nice margin left after the hon. gentlemen had spent \$11,500. I hope it may be possible next year for the hon. Ministers to remain in the Capital more constantly and attend to their special duties, without travelling over the country and imposing such a heavy charge on the people.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why is Mr. Schreiber paid as a departmental officer instead of his salary being charged to the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Schreiber was appointed, as the hon. gentleman knows, to the position he now holds previous to the change of Government in 1873.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not to be chief engineer of the Intercolonial.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; to the same office as he now holds. After full investigation, the Government came to the conclusion that the best mode of administering economically the Intercolonial Railway was to have the responsible officer a permanent officer of the Department at headquarters; and having arrived at that conclusion, after an examination and report by an able officer specially sent down, Mr. Schreiber was appointed Chief Engineer of Government Railways in operation, and he has remained a permanent officer of the Department from that time. While he was engaged mainly on the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, I think the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did largely employ him after the change of Government. The hon. gentleman very naturally would charge his salary to the construction of the Intercolonial. Mr. Schreiber's salary never was charged to the operation of the Intercolonial.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He had nothing to do with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He had nothing to do with the operating of the Intercolonial; but that was the position to which he had been appointed previous to the change of Government, that of chief responsible officer, and that at headquarters.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So \$4,000 which should be charged to the working of the Intercolonial is charged to the Department here, making the expenditure on the Intercolonial that much less than it should be. Mr. Brydges was Superintendent of all Government Railways, not as Engineer, but as General Superintendent. Mr. McNabb was Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial in my time, and when the change of Government occurred, Mr. Schreiber was put practically in his place. Mr. McNabb had no successor except Mr. Schreiber.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Archibald is Mr. McNabb's successor, and discharges precisely the duties Mr. McNabb performed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But he was not at first.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Archibald succeeded Mr. McNabb as Engineer of the Intercolonial, and fills the same position that Mr. McNabb filled previously. The hon. gentleman is aware that Mr. Schreiber is Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway as well as of the other Government railways. The chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway was receiving a salary of \$6,000 for that service alone; and Mr. Schreiber has succeeded him, and is only charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway service some \$2,000 for his additional services with relation to that work, in addition to the salary he has as a permanent officer, as Chief Engineer of Government Railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course, the duties of the Canadian Pacific Railway are very materially changed. There are little or no duties now to perform compared with what was the case when the other engineer was receiving

\$6,000. The surveys were not then completed. Many engineering works were still to be attended to; the plans and bridges and everything of that sort, and the entire work except certain sections given out to the Company for which the Company paid but \$2,000 formerly—now it is very much more than \$6,000; in relation to the work performed I am not complaining of the salary as a whole at all, I know that Mr. Schreiber is an able man. I quite admit that, but I complain of the distribution and mode of payment.

20. Stationery Office for stationery..... \$7,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex.) This is the same vote as last year, I suppose it is an open vote.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

22. Amount required to provide for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner for Canada in London..... \$4,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I will lend all attention to this expenditure. I remember very well that when Sir A. T. Galt was appointed High Commissioner, we were assured that the expenditure would not be very large. However, it has grown to be quite a considerable sum even now. We paid him last year \$10,000; and according to the Auditor-General's report, \$5,085 for expenses connected with his office in England; and \$1,500 for travelling expenses to Manitoba; in all, he drew for one year, \$16,585. The vote just proposed is \$4,000 connected with his office in London. His contingent expenses last year were over \$5,000. Can the hon. Minister of Finance tell us, whether he expects these contingent office expenses to be kept within the \$4,000. I see by an Order in Council he was allowed \$3,500 in lieu of house rent, fuel, light and taxes; and besides, he drew for house rent and repairs last year \$132, for fuel \$45, for gas \$41 and for income-tax \$243.33, besides travelling expenses. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is able to tell us now, whether he is going to confine the High Commissioner within the vote proposed, \$4,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The first vote was sufficient to pay rent. We gave him \$10,000 and fitted up the house and paid rent and other expenses; but we thought that it would be more satisfactory every way to make \$4,000 cover all contingencies—house rent and everything of that kind. It was understood, and so acted upon, that if he had to visit Paris or Madrid, or any other portion of the continent, as High Commissioner of the Dominion, and endeavor to arrange treaties and that kind of thing, the expenses he so incurred would be paid. These are to cover expenses connected with his London residence. I presume that the items the hon. gentleman refers to were probably made in connection with the immigration office—at the Victoria Chambers.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I see we are charged £103 stg. for expenses on a mission to Paris connected with the commercial convention negotiations; £9 stg. for expenses to and from Dublin; and £26 stg. for ocean passage to Canada. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what services he rendered the country by these trips? What was the result of his mission to Paris, Dublin or Canada? And what was the public necessity for his trip to Manitoba, for which we are charged \$1,500, which, as I stated before to the House, are charged to Capital Account, and not to ordinary revenue?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With reference to the trip to Dublin, this item may probably be found in the present year; he went there to consult with the authorities on the subject of immigration. He went to Paris in connection with treaty arrangements which have not been as successful as could be desired, but are not yet closed; as to his