

lose anything by placing it in the estimated revenue. It was in this wise that the Government, as the Auditor General had made arrangements with the Commercial Bank for \$25,000, amount of its liability, which was however, to be called for only in absolute necessity.

The Export duty last year amounted to \$3,105, and it was only reasonable to estimate it for the coming year at \$2,240. Our casual and territorial revenue would yield \$80,000.

This estimated a refund of \$1,000 from the Dominion Government, being amount advanced for carrying mails.

Counting these along with the smaller sources of revenue, which the Auditor also explained, made up the sum of \$446,787.40. Adding to this the balance on hand \$1,100,000, 1870, \$183,043.80, the balance on hand total of \$229,831.40.

From this there must be deducted the following items:—  
Unpaid on old appropriations, \$7,000  
Amount Commercial Bank liability that may not be available in 71, 21,000  
Proportion of Dominion subsidy belonging to Nov. and Dec. in fiscal year 1872, 55,000

Deducting this amount, there had as the total available money for 1871, the sum of \$140,832.40.

It had been stated by hon. members that he had said on affairs were in a disastrous condition. He had said that the estimates had been made up, he would have to take the amount for Debates out of the By-road fund.

The amount estimated for Great Roads was \$85,000, and it would require the most exact economy to make this amount answer the wants of the country in this service.

He passed on to the different items of appropriations, the Secretary made the important statement that we must remember that in 6 years the Dominion subsidy would end. For coming year, estimated income over expenditure was \$170,431.

As at the end of 6 years we would get the subsidy no longer, and as if the Dominion Government were to give us the subsidy on the excess of our debt, it was necessary for us to raise it. (The Secretary meant the additional allowance of \$103,000.—*Ex. SECRETARY.*)

Mr. White—Will we have to pay back interest on the unsettled claims if decided against us?

Ex. Secretary—We will not be charged, for until the claims are settled, no interest can be chargeable. It is in my view of the case, under no circumstances, would we have to bring up resolutions regarding the unsettled claims.

Mr. White—Will we have to pay back interest on the unsettled claims if decided against us?

Ex. Secretary—We will not be charged, for until the claims are settled, no interest can be chargeable. It is in my view of the case, under no circumstances, would we have to bring up resolutions regarding the unsettled claims.

Mr. White—Will we have to pay back interest on the unsettled claims if decided against us?

Ex. Secretary—We will not be charged, for until the claims are settled, no interest can be chargeable. It is in my view of the case, under no circumstances, would we have to bring up resolutions regarding the unsettled claims.

Mr. White—Will we have to pay back interest on the unsettled claims if decided against us?

Ex. Secretary—We will not be charged, for until the claims are settled, no interest can be chargeable. It is in my view of the case, under no circumstances, would we have to bring up resolutions regarding the unsettled claims.

Mr. White—Will we have to pay back interest on the unsettled claims if decided against us?

Ex. Secretary—We will not be charged, for until the claims are settled, no interest can be chargeable. It is in my view of the case, under no circumstances, would we have to bring up resolutions regarding the unsettled claims.

Mr. White—Will we have to pay back interest on the unsettled claims if decided against us?

Ex. Secretary—We will not be charged, for until the claims are settled, no interest can be chargeable. It is in my view of the case, under no circumstances, would we have to bring up resolutions regarding the unsettled claims.

Mr. White—Will we have to pay back interest on the unsettled claims if decided against us?

report of the Committee, which had gone to Ottawa, would be laid before the House.

The rest of the morning was consumed in the discussion of the Bill incorporating the town of Port Huron, and the Bill for the amendment of the Act relating to the Bay of Quinte.

Mr. Tibbits presented a petition in favor of the division of the County of Victoria.

In reply to Mr. Lindsay, Tibbits, chairman of the Contingent Committee, said he had written for papers which had not yet been sent to the Speaker's room for the use of the House.

After dinner, Adams asked the Chief Commissioner, Hon. Mr. Kelly, about the contracts for building a certain road in Northumberland.

Mr. Adams made a good speech about the road, which was quite short, and Mr. Kelly explained that the road was not yet built.

Mr. White led off in opposition to the bill. He said it would restrict trade between the different Counties, and he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

Mr. White said that he thought the House should have fuller information of how the money voted last year had been expended.

different conclusions, as it is very plain that a direct line from St. Marys to the mouth of the River, on the Eastern side of the River, would be a great improvement.

Again the local traffic must undoubtedly be larger on the Eastern route, as it is a well known fact that the chief article of export from this Province is lumber, and it is no less a fact that 11-12ths of the lumber of York, Carleton and Victoria, is on the Eastern side of the river, with abundant water power for its manufacture.

And there is also an inexhaustible quantity of iron ore and lime stone, which only await a proper outlet to be developed; and which will not only contribute to the support of the R.R., but materially add to the wealth of the Province.

Again the Courier says:—By the route on the Western side of the river the road would pass through a settled and productive country, whereas the Eastern side is little else than a wilderness.

By carrying the road up the Eastern side of the river through the wilderness it will be an unprofitable undertaking, both for the Province and for the people of the Province.

We are surprised that the Courier should have fallen into such an egregious error; as it is a well known fact that the chief article of export from this Province is lumber, and it is no less a fact that 11-12ths of the lumber of York, Carleton and Victoria, is on the Eastern side of the river, with abundant water power for its manufacture.

It is admitted by all that the Provincial subsidy of ten thousand acres per mile must be selected from the vacant lands of York, Carleton and Victoria, on the Eastern side of the river.

Would it not be very unprofitable for the Province to have 1,500,000 acres of Crown lands to help settle and develop the resources of Arctostook county, and like the case of Inter-colonial R.R. sacrifice the Province in order to satisfy sectional interest.

In the history of R. Roads where public lands have been given to aid in their construction, and where a single instance where the road has not run through or been contiguous with those lands. The Union and Northern Pacific American R.R. roads demonstrate the wisdom of building through wilderness lands.

We find in the prospective Canada Pacific Railway it is expected to build through the land grants through which the road will pass.

Why should New Brunswick be an exception?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

For the company, would it not be expected to derive a revenue of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) per acre from the lands which it would have to pass through?

An act to amend the Census Act.  
An act to incorporate Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

An act to amend the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, relating to the Church of England in that Province.

From the Report of the Minister of Agriculture we gather the following facts.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OF CANADA.—In 1870 there were 11,442 letters received by the Department against 9,916 in 1869. The number of letters sent was 26,276, against 19,844 in the previous year.

The number of immigrants who arrived last year and were attended to by the Department was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.

The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869. The number of immigrants who arrived in 1870 was 25,857, against 30,326 in 1869.