

speaking twice. The hon. gentleman also committed a breach of order in bringing up this subject, which is not at all germane to the subject now before the House. I will say this, that when I promised a commission it was in answer to charges made by the then member for Huron (Mr. Cameron); it had no reference to the statements made by the hon. gentleman opposite, I think.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is wrong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, very well. If I remember rightly, the statements made by the hon. member for Brant were answered at once and on the spot fully and satisfactorily by the hon. gentleman behind me. But I will say this: Let the hon. gentleman bring up this subject separately and we will discuss it in all its bearings. As to the vague challenge made by Mr. Cameron, that I would meet him on the hustings and discuss 999 specific charges against the Government and bring up 999 answers to those charges, and that I should keep an audience for hours, even for days, was an absurdity. It meant nothing—it was a mere matter of bravado. It was only by specific charges being brought in words and figures that they could be dealt with. Every charge brought was answered, and answered in the only way it could be answered. The speech of the hon. gentleman was fully reported in *Hansard*. The charges were specifically made, and they affected men in the North-West, civil servants, who had their own characters to maintain, officers whose conduct was challenged; and evidence was taken on the subject. I am quite satisfied that in the opinion of the country that answer was full and satisfactory. But let us not enter into this discussion on a question about warrants. Let the hon. member for Brant make his motion, and he will have a full opportunity of discussing it, and we will have a full opportunity of replying.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was very much taken aback by the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the law, which is very specific and precise, had been violated by warrants having been issued after the meeting of Parliament; and I communicated with Mr. McGee, the Clerk of the Privy Council, and I will send across the House the statement which he returned, and which shows that those dates are inaccurate. The trouble has arisen from a typographical error or an error in the manuscript.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the date of the Governor General's warrant or to the date of the Order in Council?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These are the dates of the warrants.

Mr. MILLS. I think they will be found to be also the dates of the Orders in Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. McGee writes:

"I have corrected the enclosed list in red ink showing dates of Orders in Council authorising special warrants, in so far as the date 14th April is mentioned."

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that that does not touch the question. The point made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was as to the issue of the warrants. The Governor General has no legal authority to issue a warrant for the expenditure of public money when Parliament is in Session. It does not matter whether an Order in Council was passed or not. The very moment Parliament meets the Order in Council becomes inoperative, no action can be taken upon it; and the hon. gentleman will see that the additional information he has furnished does not add to that we have already before us, in regard to the correctness of the date, in regard to the issue of the Governor General's warrant, but it is merely additional information as to the date of the Order in Council

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

on which that warrant was based. Now, so far as the law is concerned, it is not of the slightest consequence when the Order was passed; the law assumes immediate action. Suppose it was passed before Parliament met, and the Governor General's warrant was issued after the meeting of Parliament. Would not the absurdity of such a step being taken be perfectly apparent to everybody? and it is not the less a violation of the law that it was issued a few days after the Order in Council was carried. After Parliament was in Session the Governor General had no power or right to act; he has no power except under the supreme and urgent necessity of the State, and when Parliament is not in Session. After Parliament is in Session and is capable of acting, the Governor General has no authority to act on behalf of Parliament, and to invoke his authority in such a case is clearly an act in violation of the law of the land. I was rather surprised at the speech made by the hon. the Finance Minister. He has made many speeches during the last twenty years, since I have been in Parliament, but I never heard him make a reply so weak as the reply he made to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He took up this statement of the issue of the Governor General's warrants; he admitted that the action of the Government was a violation of the law; but did the hon. gentleman assign any reason why the Government, in any one of these particular instances, should have taken the course they did take?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not admit that the action of the Government was in violation of the law. I stated that I agreed with the general principle laid down by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who formerly occupied the position I now occupy, that the Governor General's warrant should not issue except in the case of necessity, as provided by the statute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman admitted that the Governor General's warrants had issued for some expenditures which he said provision had been made by Parliament, but which had lapsed. Now, what is the rule with regard to these appropriations? Why should they lapse at all? If the view which he endeavored to impress upon the House be the correct view, why should a warrant be necessary? Why should there be a provision that appropriations should lapse after a specific time? We know that, under the provisions of the law, the Government may extend the period for which appropriations are made, for three months, by an Order in Council, but they cannot extend them further than that. Parliament, in its wisdom, must see some propriety in limiting the period for which appropriations that have lapsed might be extended by Order in Council. Now, the period for which Parliament had limited the expenditure, expired. Then what was the position of the Government with regard to that expenditure? They were precisely in the same position as if Parliament had not made the appropriations at all. Parliament may have seen sufficient cause for making the appropriation at the time. But the Administration, acting perhaps upon the view which it knew Parliament would take, failed to make the expenditure, and allowed the appropriation to lapse; and what then? That appropriation having so lapsed, the Government were in precisely the position they would have been in had such an appropriation never been made. Then what answer does the hon. gentleman intend by the observations which he has made? In what way does he meet the objection made by the hon. member for South Oxford, that these were appropriations which had lapsed, and that the Government had no power to make them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the contrary, the hon. member for South Oxford passed over the lapsed balances, as having been approved by Parliament, and therefore not coming within his strictures.