

panies are interested, but I have no stock, no interest whatever in it, except as a professional man in my capacity as solicitor.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to say one word, in order to show the good faith in which I acted in this matter in quoting from the "Parliamentary Companion." I will read from that book again, to show how far I was justified. I believe the International of Maine, is a road that was subsidised by this Government.

Mr. IVES. That was not the gravamen of the charge.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was not speaking of the charters given by this House, but of the roads that received subsidies from this House. I quoted in good faith from the book, and in doing so I acted from a stern sense of public duty. I have no desire to injure the feelings of the hon. member at all. This is what the "Parliamentary Companion" says, in reference to that gentleman:

"He was called to the bar of the Province of Quebec in the year 1867; was appointed Q.C. on the 11th October, 1880. Is president of the Dominion Cattle Company, of Texas, and a director of the International Company, of Maine."

Mr. IVES. That is just what I said.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the hon. gentleman is quite in his right in making the statement. But in order that the explanation may be complete, I desire to say that I suppose the statement that I have seen in the press that he was the person who signed the contract for a subsidy from the Government of Canada, the Minister of Railways being the signatory on the part of the Government, and himself on the part of the company, is not correct?

Mr. IVES. It is not correct at all. The contract was signed by the president of the company, and not by myself, who never held that position.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RELEASE OF BONDS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House receive the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolutions respecting the release to the company of the amount held as security for the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said: one or two points were brought up in respect of these resolutions when they were in committee. The first was respecting the application of the bonds that are to be raised upon the Algoma branch. I propose to insert in the Bill this clause:

But the proceeds of such bonds shall be applied exclusively to the cost of construction and equipment of the said Algoma branch, including a bridge over the said river.

And further on:

Exclusive application of the proceeds of said bonds for the purposes hereinbefore defined shall be secured in case of default.

And so on. I will insert in the Bill a clause applying strictly the proceeds of the mortgage to the completion of the Algoma branch, as well as the bridge over the river; also a clause with respect to the bonds that are in the hands of the public and that are not yet taken up and not provided for, stating:

Nothing herein contained shall affect or impair the security or remedies of the holders of outstanding land grant bonds.

I propose to insert in the Bill founded upon the resolutions these two clauses. I understand the latter one is satisfactory to the bondholders in all respects.

Mr. BLAKE. After the statement of the hon. gentleman—of course it is impossible properly to appreciate the value of words one hears across the floor—but it occurred to me that the first phrase the hon. gentleman used was, perhaps, not exactly adequate to carry out his intentions, because it is, as he read, that the

Mr. IVES.

proceeds of the Algoma branch bonds are to be applied to the construction of the branch as well. As I understand the arrangement when we agreed to that special mortgage, it was to the completion of the branch. What I mean is this: that it should not be competent to the railway company, having issued bonds upon the Algoma branch, to take two millions and a-half of the proceeds of those bonds and say: We shall use them to apply them to the work we have already constructed; but that the money raised upon the whole and already constructed work was to be applied to the completion of the work. However, it is not easy to hear the words accurately across the House, and I shall not attempt to discuss them now. So far as I can judge from the explanation of the hon. gentleman's proposals, they are, in both these respects, reasonably satisfactory; but as inasmuch as one cannot form a final judgment upon them, nor upon some other points to which I wish to call the attention of the House before this measure receives its final reading, and I shall not detain the House now, preferring to wait till the opportunity which will be afforded when we have the measure of the hon. gentleman fully before us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Finance, whether these same bonds in the hands of the public are not liable to be redeemed by the railway company on payment of 10 per cent. premium?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, they might easily close the whole affair, then.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 94) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the committee will allow me, there are one or two clauses I should like to go back to for the purpose of making merely verbal alterations. The first is clause 3, in regard to the different forms. The clause at present provides that these shall be changed by the Minister of Interior, with the approval of the Governor in Council. I propose to leave out the words "with the approval of the Governor in Council."

Mr. BLAKE. I thought when this clause was inserted that it was one of very doubtful propriety, and I think it is made still more objectionable by the proposed amendment. If there is one thing important it is that the forms on which the various steps are based which are required to be taken in order to acquire those titles, should be general forms, the same for all persons. But the hon. gentleman proposes, not merely to take power to make forms applicable to a special class of cases, but also forms applicable to any special case. And now he proposes that the power shall be conferred on the departmental Minister. What does that mean? It means that those forms are to be moulded to suit each case, as the Minister pleases, and thus there is no certainty whatever. The regular form may be used in one case and a different form in another, and no one is to know, with any degree of certainty, what the real limit of the obligation may be. The proposal affords the greatest possible loophole for fraud.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the hon. gentleman has magnified the importance of the clause, which has been pressed upon me as being of great convenience to the Land