

Mr. HAGGART. It amounts to the difference between \$75 and \$105. Twelve cents a mile would be about \$75 per year. There would then be an increase of about \$30.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the practice before? Was the Canadian Pacific Railway receiving \$105 on part of its track, and 12 cents on the remainder, or was it receiving 12 cents on all?

Mr. HAGGART. This increase applies solely to the main line, the \$75,000. You will see in the other estimates, there is an increased expenditure from Montreal to St. John.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then do I understand from the Postmaster General that virtually under this vote the post office allowance to the Canadian Pacific Railway is changed from \$75 per mile to \$105 along the whole line?

Mr. HAGGART. On the main line between Montreal and Vancouver, which is 2,915 miles; it is a change from \$75 per mile per annum to \$105 per mile per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then if you will just lay the Order in Council making that change on the Table at your earliest convenience—

Mr. HAGGART. I will lay it on the Table on Monday.

Amount required to cover unprovided items for 1889-90, as per Auditor General's Report, page A-79.....\$709,748.64

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The details I find on page 78. Take, for instance, the item for railways, under the head of collection of revenue. There I see an unprovided expenditure of \$302,958. Surely that would have been foreseen before the end of the year 1890, and ought to have been provided for in the Supplementary Estimates of last year. Prorogation took place on the 23rd of May, that was within five weeks of the end of the year, and I should like to know of the Minister of Finance how it comes that so very large a sum as \$302,958 should have been left unprovided for. With common care on the part of the officials of the department that sum ought to have been foreseen, and the Government ought to have been communicated with. Were the Government communicated with, or did the officials not know before the 25th of May that so large a deficit would have to be met?

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this matter I cannot say from recollection that the Government was communicated with. I think if the Government had been communicated with, it would have brought down the sum in the Estimates to cover the deficiency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The chief official is there,

Mr. FOSTER. No, he is gone.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, he ought to be sent for, because that is a matter which, to my mind, rather reflects, and reflects seriously, on the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and is a thing about which we ought to have some explanation—unless there was some extraordinary cause which it is not easy to understand. It was that officer's duty to have communi-

cated to the Government, long before the 23rd of May, that there would be a very serious deficiency, giving the Government the option of obtaining a vote from the House. It is quite clear that, *prima facie*, this reflects gravely on the management of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. It may not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say, *prima facie* it does. The idea that this House should rise on the 23rd of May, and a department like that of railways should not know within \$302,000 what its expenditure was going to be, sheds a very ugly light on the way in which that department is managed—unless there is some explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate would have been brought down six weeks before that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the department ought, in all conscience, to have advised the Government before the House rose, that there was going to be this deficiency, if they knew it, and it was very difficult to see how they could have avoided knowing it. I do not myself complain about a moderate sum of unprovided items, knowing that these expenses will occur. For instance, in the Post Office, which is our nearly next largest expending department, there were items unprovided for to the amounts of \$56,230, and lapsed balances to the amount of \$56,319; so that I would not be at all disposed to complain of that. There are always certain amounts in each department which lapse over, but here you will see there was only an insignificant lapsed balance of \$15,900, and this huge gap.

Mr. FOSTER. If you look at A-74 you will see that the whole of that amount is covered by Governor General's warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but that is exactly what the Governor General's warrant should not be taken for, unless there was a reasonable ground for alleging that it was entirely unforeseen. That is an abuse of the Governor General's warrants, and we have been complaining against the system for several years back in this House. The departments, knowing that the Governor General's warrant is issued nowadays without sufficient investigation—I do not reflect on the hon. gentlemen, but I speak of the facts—knowing that they neglect to apprise the Government before the House rises of the fact that the expenditure is to be largely exceeded; and then we come to have such items as this one before us.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether the Governor General's warrant was taken before the House or not, it should have been covered in the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A thing of that kind could by no possibility escape the attention of the Ministers. Long before 24th of May they must have known there was going to be a big gap.

Mr. FOSTER. I think probably that Governor's warrant was got before the House met in 1891, not after it had risen. That fact is no justification, for the amount should have been embodied in the Estimates if it was issued before the House met.

Mr. MULOCK. Why should not the reports of Ministers on which Governor General's warrants are issued be laid on the Table. We have simply a statement, but not a report.