

spirit of fairness. A committee, however, had placed the facts before the House, and it was in the power of the hon. member to revive a discussion on the subject, if he desired it.

Mr. MILLER stated that he had been chairman of the committee in question, and considered it his duty to say in justice to an absent officer that the remarks which had fallen from the hon. member from Victoria, in the heat of the moment, were not altogether warranted by the facts of the case. The committee had closely investigated the charge made against the department, and came to the conclusion that there was no evidence adduced that the mistakes in reference to the dates were other than the result of accident. He thought, however, that it would have been advisable if the debate had been published fully; but he did not for a moment attribute to the officer in charge of the reports any improper motives. He presumed that it had been found necessary to omit the debate in consequence of a press of matter which was considered by the reporter of more general importance. Every one in the House, he was sure, would bear testimony to the impartial manner in which that officer had always endeavored to discharge the duty entrusted to him.

Mr. C. J. CAMPBELL said that if he had had an opportunity of bringing up the conduct of the officer in the Crown Lands the verdict given would have been very different. The committee, it would be remembered, were not judge and jury. He considered that he had been quite justified, under all the circumstances of the case, in censuring the conduct of the officer in question, for no man in his sound senses could have altered facts and figures in the way they were in the case in question. If that officer were capable of such conduct, then he was not fit for the position he held. As respects the Act of 1859, it would be seen by reference to its provisions that it had not been strictly carried out. Commissioners in each county were to be appointed, who were to report to the Government the value of the lands that were not granted, and the amount realized in their sale was to be expended for the benefit of Cape Breton; but not one dollar had been spent as yet. Instead of getting credit for this act, he had been actually blamed for passing what was injurious to the people. The reason why it was so considered was, that it was not carried out as it should have been. In conclusion, the hon. gentleman denied that Cape Breton had been more favored than Nova Scotia. The fact was, that in many cases the people had been called upon to pay for land for which they had already paid.

Hon. FIN. SECRETARY said that if it were true that a person was called upon to pay for land twice, then a manifest injustice was committed, but he was sure that the act in question never contemplated any thing of the kind.—The operations of that act were intended to be of benefit to Cape Breton, and he considered it was entitled to the praise, rather than the censure of gentlemen. At the instance of the Legislature the period of payment for these lands had been actually extended from three to five years. Surveys had been made, titles perfected, limits defined, and all disputes settled, and persons holding the land had five years to pay for them. And more than this, the net proceeds arising did not go into the treasury for the general benefit, but were set apart for the

opening up of new roads in Cape Breton. In respect to the other matter referred to, he believed that the hon. member for Victoria had not received that justice to which he was entitled, though he did not think that the omission to report the debate had originated from any desire to injure the hon. gentleman. He thought that if the question had been fully reported, it might have the tendency to prevent similar mistakes occurring in the future. It was right, however, for him to add that as far as his own knowledge went, the head of the Crown Lands Department was always anxious to do everything in his power to discharge his duty faithfully.

Mr. S. McDONNELL said he could not agree with hon. gentlemen as to the advantages Cape Breton received from the act in question. It had been insinuated by some hon. gentlemen that the inhabitants of Cape Breton enjoyed the profit of the money paid for these lands themselves. This was the first time that the matter had been brought to his notice, and he was determined that the country should know what amount of money had been enjoyed by Cape Breton. He would therefore request the Government to lay on the table information in respect to the amount paid into the Treasury from the four counties of Cape Breton under the act in reference to the settlement of titles in Cape Breton; also a return of the amounts expended in the island in pursuance of the 10th section of that act, and for what purpose.

Hon. PROV. SEC. replied that the law provided that the inhabitants of Cape Breton were entitled to have the net proceeds expended in the island. If the money had not been expended, the island was certainly entitled to it.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that in the book he held in his hand (the new edition of the Revised Statutes) it would be seen that the law provided that Nova Scotia should exactly enjoy the same privilege as Cape Breton with regard to the laying out of crown lands hereafter. The crown lands, under the 26th chap., were to be laid off in 100 acre lots, and the amount derived from their sale laid out in the opening of roads through these tracts. The act applied to the other settlers in the country as well as to emigrants. He thought the money alluded to by his colleague should be expended as provided by the law.

Hon. FIN. SECRETARY said it would be found that as yet there were no net proceeds to be expended. The law provided that the parties holding the lands should have three years to pay for them, and that period had been subsequently extended to five. When this term expired then Cape Breton would be able to obtain the expenditure of the money in the manner proposed. At present Cape Breton was actually indebted, he thought, to Nova Scotia for the expenses incurred in settling the disputes, making surveys, &c., in the island.

Mr. LEVESCONTE said that he must protest against the supposition that the act in question had been of any advantage to his county. If it had not been passed individuals occupying lands on the coast and harbors in Richmond could have gone to the Crown Lands department, and obtained a grant of 100 acres for ten or twelve pounds. As it was, however, a commissioner had gone down to Cape Breton, and the result was that parties had to pay as much for a small lot, perhaps only an acre or half an acre, as for the larger amount of 100 acres.