knows it, while we do not know any more than is contained in four or five lines of a telegram. I mention these only as examples. It appears to me that intelligent provision should be made for the demands of Parliament in these respects, so that we might be relieved of much of our present difficulty, and would be supplied with the material for a more intelligent discussion of public questions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be all right to introduce a new practice; but I do not know that any Government since Confederation has followed the course the hon. gentleman suggests. A Minister bringing a measure before Parliament should, of his own motion, bring down the necessary papers in connection with it. But I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, that the expenditures for preparing Departmental returns are properly part of the Departmental Contingencies. The Contingencies of a Department are the contingent expenses of that Department. If Parliament wants to get information, the expense should not form part of these Contingencies. On every political platform they will say: Look at this extravagant Government and at the enormous contingencies in every Department. If hon. members take the responsibility of making motions which we know cause great expense, the responsibility should be put upon them individually, and on Parliament as a whole.

Mr. BLAKE. It is very well to adopt a new practice now, but the other one has been in existence since ten years ago, and this will enable the Government to show not a reduction, but an amount the same as last year for Contingencies, when they should really show a large increase.

303. Miscellaneous-Factory Commission, advance to

Mr, Blakely.....\$300,00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Blakely was employed to visit Massachusetts, and report before Parliament met, the results and operation of the factory system there.

Mr. BLAKE. There are valuable reports of this issued by the State of Massachusetts, which would have given the hon. gentleman all he required.

## 306, Miscellaneous—500 copies of the "Parliamentary Companion"......\$1,000,00

Mr. BLAKE. This book is getting smaller and dearer every year. I remember when it only cost \$1.50 and was considerably larger, and, besides, this year I have heard many complaints that it contains a great many inaccuracies. I would like to know what are done with the 200 copies in excess of the 300 required to supply the members.

Mr. CASEY. They cannot be required in the Departments, for a division sheet would give the Departments all the information they require, the names and counties of hon. members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This volume is rather a flattering biography of each of us, but I do not know that it will give much information to the public if every member of Parliament keeps his own volume to himself. In order to make the publication of any value each member should give it to some intelligent supporter in his county. I really cannot tell what is done with the other two hundred. They are not burnt or locked up—I think they must be in use in the Departments. I have not seen the volume this year and cannot speak as to its appearance or accuracy, but I am inclined to think that \$2 a volume is rather a high price. Of course, it depends altogether on whether it is paying or not; if it is not paying the publisher will drop it.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not object to the grant for the "Parliamentary Companion" if it was properly prepared. When I was at the head of the Department of Justice fifty copies were taken in that Department. I thought that was unreasonable, and we cut the number down to four copies, which was amply sufficient.

Mr. BOWELL. This is to cover damages to C. A. Robertson under the fishery lease which the Provincial and Exchequer Courts, and subsequently the Supreme Court, declared to have been illegally granted by the Crown. am informed this was a test case between the Minister of Justice and the counsel for Mr. Robertson.

Mr. BLAKE. How much of that was damages and how much costs?

Mr. WELDON. The costs recovered by Hanson against Robertson were about \$1,600, the costs in the Supreme Court having been about \$1,100.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is in consequence of a suit brought by the Merchants' Bank vs. The Queen, for the repayment of slide dues collected on timber that had gone through the slides. I think I stated a few days ago, in introducing a Bill on the subject, that the Government had been unable to force the payment of those dues --not that they were unable to enforce the payment of the dues on the lumber, but in this case, dues had accrued for several years, and an arrengement was made between the parties and the Department that they should pay the highest rate of dues, that is, \$2 per thousand, on the timber that had passed through, until the whole amount was paid off. They paid \$2 the first year after the arrangement was made. They held afterwards that they had paid it unwittingly, not knowing it to be an excessive charge. The second year they received payment, but the Department enforced the full payment of \$2 per thousand. The case went to court, and the Judges took the ground that all that the lumber was liable for was the charge due upon that particular quantity, and that it was not liable for stumpage due on the previous years' cut. Therefore, the case was given against the Crown, and the money paid in under protest had to be repaid.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the Merchants Bank the original defaulter ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Skead was the operator.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the default still exists for those back dues?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The case having failed, the Government It was almost impossible to collect will lose that amount. dues on the passing of timber through the slide. In 1873, 1874, 1875, when the times were hard, no steps were taken to collect those ducs. There is no difficulty when one year's dues are alone to be collected, but two or three years' dues had accrued in the case I have mentioned. By an arrange. ment made between Mr. Skead and the Department, he agreed to pay a higher rate of dues in order to cover his arrears. For the first year the amount was paid, and then the Merchants' Bauk stepped in.

313. Post Office ...... \$142,720,00

Mr. CARLING. A large portion of this amount, no less than \$33,720 is to pay the Intercolonial Railway an additional rate of \$20 per mile for post office service. There is something like \$45,000 additional for services in Manitoba and the North-West, and other amounts for an increase of business in all portions of the Dominion, especially in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what was the previous rate on the Intercolonial?

Mr. CARLING. It was \$100 a mile; this year it will be \$120, and next year it will be \$130. The rate paid on the Grand Trunk is \$160; Great Western, \$124.