

copy of the instrument of incorporation or association of the said Construction Company; and a statement of the names of the shareholders or associates thereof.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways has conferred with the hon. gentleman who has just made this motion, about the difficulty of granting it. The fact is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having given a contract to another company to prosecute a portion of this work, that second company has, of course, given some contracts to different parties, and it would be more than inconvenient that the contract given by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the second company should be made known. The hon. gentleman will see at once that it would be very inconvenient, and would necessarily cause trouble in the prosecution of that work, if the terms granted to the other company by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were made known to the sub-contractors of that second company. I think there can be no difficulty arising out of the postponement of such information. The rates are established, I think, from year to year, or at shorter periods, subject to the approval of the Government; therefore, there can be no difficulty in this matter being postponed to another year, when the sub-contracts having been executed, there can be no objection in the contract given by the Canadian Pacific Railway being made public. I, therefore, hope that under these circumstances the hon. gentleman will see the propriety of not insisting upon his motion.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry I am not able to accede to the views of the hon. gentleman. The law, rightly or wrongly, requires that the contracts should be laid before the House; the law does not require this particular contract to be laid before the House at this time, but the law has laid down the proposition that the contracts made by the Company should be laid before the House, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has thought fit to disobey the law in that regard. The hon. gentleman has rightly said that the hon. Minister of Railways gave me private explanations of the causes which induced the Company to disobey the law namely, that it would affect their contract with Langdon, Shepherd & Co., being a contract at schedule prices for the earth work, &c. He told me that it would create some difficulty with the sub-contracts with Langdon, Shepherd & Co. But this contract to which I am now referring—I have only the information in the press to guide me—is a contract of a very different complexion, it is a contract for the construction of the whole of the remainder of the line.

Mr. POPE. From whom?

Mr. BLAKE. The statement in the papers is, that it is a contract for the construction of the whole line unexecuted. I am merely saying what the newspapers say. Of course, I know nothing about it; but the statement is, that it is a contract for the whole of their unexecuted works. I presume it, therefore, to be of the nature of a sub-contract, but I do not know in which case the difficulty that was suggested by the hon. Minister would not arise. But it seems to me, as I thought it right, at an early period of the Session, to bring before the House what seemed to me to be the complications that were about to arise from the circumstance of this stock being issued in the way it has been issued—it seems to me that what has been developed within a few days in the statement which has come to us from abroad, is a further complication and a further step in the same direction. Therefore, I do not feel that I can take the responsibility of withdrawing my motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say that the Government does not feel that the public interest would be served by bringing the document down and laying it before the country at present. I do not say that after a time it may not be brought down—I think the contrary—but at

present it would not be in favor of the public interest to bring it down, and I would still offer the hon. gentleman the option of withdrawing his motion.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend's objection must be attained in some other way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman does not wish to withdraw his motion, of course, I must ask the House to refuse assent to it, because we think, as a Government, that it would not be for the public interest for this to be brought down. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. POPE. I think I may relieve the hon. gentleman from a little misapprehension about this matter. I am quite certain there is no such contract as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, but that the work is left to the same men who had it last year, and I know these parties made a contract to build to the foot of the Rocky Mountains.

Motion negatived.

#### QUEBEC SUBSIDY.

Mr. LAURIER moved for a copy of any representation by either of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec on the subject of an increase of the Provincial subsidy. He said: It is well known that the Quebec Legislature has adopted a memorial to the Dominion Government, representing that the Province should have an increased subsidy. We have not heard anything of this memorial since. Perhaps it has not yet got into the hands of the Government; but if it has been presented to the Government, it should, in the public interest, be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

#### GEOLOGICAL REPORTS OF THE COUNTIES OF VICTORIA, INVERNESS AND RICHMOND.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Before reading my motion I desire to place before the House a few facts which will show the necessity of publishing the Geological Reports, with maps, of the counties of Victoria, Inverness and Richmond, in the Island of Cape Breton. It is well known that the north-west coast of Cape Breton does not possess any harbors from which the vast mineral resources of that side of the Island can be exported. There are three or four harbors, it is true, but they are bar harbors, which only a small class of vessels can enter, a class of vessels which are not adequate for carrying coal and other minerals, of which there is an abundance on that coast. In the Geological Report for 1877-78 was published the last of four sheets of a map of Cape Breton County, on a scale of one inch to the mile, which is useful and valuable, not only to miners and explorers, but also to all interested in the county of Cape Breton, because it gives, besides the geology of this fine county, more geographical detail than any other map published. In 1877 and 1878, Richmond and that portion of Inverness which lies south of Judique and River Dennis Basin were surveyed with even greater minuteness than the county of Cape Breton; and a report of this work was written, which, however, was kept back until a few particulars could be obtained to make the accompanying maps more complete. This was done, and the maps were ready for the Report of the Geological Survey for 1879-80. Yet, in this report, the maps did not appear, although it contains an account of the work done by geological surveyors in 1877 and 1878. This comparative uselessness and incompleteness of that report, was publicly pointed out in the Cape Breton press, and in the Senate by hon. Senator Bourinot, as reported in *Hansard* of May 12th, 1882. Senator Bourinot, after pointing out the uselessness of the report with no maps accompanying it of the character stated, said:

"I regret very much that this should be so, and I have taken what I consider the best means of attaining the end which these people desire,