

of the Governor in Council, being obtained to pass it by, on good grounds shown. No expenditure is authorized by law unless that expenditure has been sanctioned by Parliament, except in one case, and that is a case which has been flagrantly abused by the present Government, not only in this contract, but in others. I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact, because it is owing to persistent and flagrant abuse of a power which they really have not, and which they claim, that they have been enabled to squander public money, from time to time, in these contracts. The law has laid down explicitly :

If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure, unforeseen or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may issue his special warrant.

Well, Sir, there is no man who would be bold enough to stand up here and declare that the facts of this case come within the purview of that provision. The Governor General's warrant in this case was issued, I say, illegally. The circumstances which could justify its issue, did not exist. There was a parliamentary grant given. That parliamentary grant was given after careful estimates had been prepared by the officers of the Railway Department, after those estimates had been endorsed by the Minister, after the Minister had laid them before this House, after he had obtained the sanction of the House to his request, and the specific sum of \$170,000 was voted for the specific purpose of building these two bridges, or rebuilding them, because they were there before. So that the department started by acting in a most unconstitutional and improper manner, thereby aiding so far as they could the wrong-doing and the misappropriation of public money. This matter has been brought before the House time and time again by the Opposition, and we have time and again pointed out that the Government improperly made use of Governor General's warrants to obtain money which they dare not ask Parliament for, and hon. gentlemen know well that if they had followed the law and come to Parliament and asked for this money they never would have obtained the sum they demanded.

But having violated the law in that respect, what did they do next? I charge the department that they violated the law, the policy of the law, in undertaking to do the work in the way they did. They were bound by law to call for tenders. They were to build two little bridges, each about 235 feet long. One would suppose

that this was not a work to tax the engineering ability of the officials of the department, and as a matter of fact we have the statement made that previous to the work being given out most careful estimates had been made as to its cost. The moment the Minister dispensed with the calling of tenders and began the work by day's work, that moment he began to open the door through which fraud could be perpetrated. Political influence then began to be brought to bear. Hon. gentlemen who wished to give employment to political friends and who found they could not give this employment if tenders were called, found the door opened wide by the Minister himself by which they could pass through as many political proteges and friends as they liked, not tens or dozens, but hundreds of the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite could be employed under this system of day's labour to an almost unlimited extent. As a matter of fact we have evidence, not disputed but admitted on all sides, that this result did follow, that no sooner was the law violated, no sooner were tenders dispensed with, and the work begun to be carried out by day's labour than hundreds of men were employed who otherwise would not have been employed, and the public treasury was wronged to that extent. We have the facts embodied in the commission's report, and we have the reasons there given why the Government undertook to build this structure by day's work, and they are the most silly and futile reasons to which I ever listened. The statement was made by the chief superintendent of the canal, and the statement which the department adopted to show that it was better to build this structure by day's work, was, to use the chief superintendent's own language, "owing to the uncertainty of the mode of execution which circumstances will command." For my part I fail to understand what the meaning of that sentence is; but that is the reason given for departing from the law and building the work by day's labour, instead of by tender, as the Government is bound by law to do. I am reading from the third page of the commissioners' report, where there is this quotation from Mr. Parent's advice to the Government. I compared it with the document itself, and I found it a literal transcript. There was no uncertainty as to the mode of execution. The hon. gentleman stated deliberately and plainly the mode of execution. It was well understood. This was not a large work; two substructures were to be built, on which steel bridges were to be placed; the work was clearly and well understood, and the most accurate estimates were made before the Government came to Parliament and asked any vote whatever for the work.

What was the next step taken by the Government? The next step was that, instead of hiring the men themselves on day's labour and keeping some check over them, they gave a private con-