

sentiment calls for the protection of the female of any age under the circumstances of seduction under promise of marriage. I felt it was impossible to secure the passage of a clause protecting females of any age, but I thought it would be a reasonable compromise to adopt the age mentioned in the Bill. I can see very little difference in protecting females under eighteen and twenty-one years, and I act in this matter in obedience to the expressed sentiment which favors legislation of this kind. Although I always feel like paying all due deference to the wishes of the right hon. gentleman, I cannot feel it to be my duty, under the circumstances, to abandon entirely the provision contained in the second clause. As a compromise I have proposed that young men shall not be liable till they are twenty-one, but that females shall have this remedy up to twenty-one years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the assurance of the hon. gentleman that there is a general sentiment in the country in favor of it—though I must say we have no assurance of that fact—I am willing to amend the clause as indicated, the punishment not exceeding two years' imprisonment.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not exceeding two years' imprisonment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very well; that makes it conform to the other provisions of the Bill with respect to other offences.

Bill reported.

#### GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright for:

Return showing the amounts (in detail) expended under warrants of the Governor General in each of the years from 1873 to 1886, both inclusive.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me from the arguments which were used by the members of the Government, when this subject was discussed in the House the other day, that they believed that the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was so worthy of imitation that they desired to imitate it in every respect. In those days we were told that if a change of Government took place all these things would be remedied, while to-day we find that when any complaint is made from this side, of their mode of managing public affairs, they immediately turn round and justify it by referring to something that was done by the previous Administration. The Minister of Justice, in this particular case, endeavored to show that the warrants which were issued in 1877 and 1878 were of a similar character, and issued under similar circumstances, to those which were brought down during the present Session. But, as I said before, I think my hon. friend was rather disingenuous in the manner in which he referred to the special warrants issued from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 9th of February, 1878. He will find, if he refers to those warrants, that they were totally different, and that they were mostly issued in October, 1877, the last one being on the 27th of December, 1877. I find that the statement is a statement of special warrants of His Excellency the Governor General issued in accordance with Act 31 Vic., cap. 5, sec. 35, from 1st July, 1877, to 9th February, 1878, inclusive, and that certified copies of the warrants and of Orders in Council recommending the same, were annexed. I find in that statement the particular reasons given why the warrants were issued. For instance,

the first one authorises an expenditure on public buildings at St. John, N.B., \$50,000. I find on the 20th of October a warrant, under the hand of the Governor General, on a report of the Privy Council, dated the 19th of October, 1877, in which it is pointed out that in consequence of the great disaster which occurred at St. John, immediate provision had to be made for the repair of certain buildings, and making a commencement to rebuild others. The fire had taken place in June, 1877, and it is stated:

"That there is no parliamentary appropriation from which such expenditure can be made, and that a necessity for the work in question is urgent and immediate, and recommending that a special warrant do issue conformably with the provisions of the 35th section of the Act 31 Vic., chap. 5, for the said amount."

Then we find that the next one was for the following services, being balances of previous appropriations which had lapsed: Ottawa buildings, the tower; western block extension; Intercolonial Railway freight cars, and expenses before the Supreme Court. I find that the report states:

"On a memorandum dated 15th October, 1877, from the hon. the Minister of Finance, stating that having had under consideration the reports of the Ministers of Public Works, Militia and Agriculture, respecting certain balances of appropriations of 1876-77 which have lapsed, and it appearing that the continued expenditure for those services, which are not otherwise provided for, is necessary, he concurs in the recommendation that those appropriations be provided for by Governor General's warrant."

That report is dated on the 15th of October, and the warrant issued on the 20th of October. Then the next one is for certain public buildings and other services, being balances of previous appropriations which had lapsed. They are as follows:—British Columbia penitentiary; public buildings, North-West; Lieutenant Governor's residence, Battleford; removal of Beacon rock, British Columbia; Guelph custom house; Shippegan harbor; grass-hopper relief; criminal statistics; Australian exhibition; Cow Bay, C.B.; ammunition and military stores. Then on the 12th of November, 1877, a warrant for what is called the Mennonite loan issued, on a report dated the 9th November, 1887. The report states:

"On a report, dated 30th October, 1887, from the hon. the Minister of Finance, stating that on a memorandum from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, representing that there was a pressing necessity for an advance to the Mennonites, for which there was no available appropriation, an Order in Council was passed, the 26th of October, advising that \$7,600, the balance unexpended of the appropriation for the Mennonite loan, in the years 1875-76, be paid into the hands of the Receiver General for that purpose; that the balance had been deposited by the Receiver General, 14th September, and that there is no authority for issuing a warrant for the amount."

Then the last one is a warrant issued on the 27th of December, 1877, on a report of a Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency in Council on the 24th December, 1877:

"On a memorandum dated 17th December, 1877, from the hon. the Minister of Public Works, representing that the Superintendent for the construction of the Government buildings and other works at Battleford and Fort Pelly, North-West Territories, reports under date 20th September last, that owing to several unexpected causes the original estimated cost of these works has been exceeded by about \$30,000, and recommending that in accordance with the provisions of Act 31 Vic., chap. 5, sub-sec. 2 of section 35, a special warrant for \$30,000 be issued to meet the extra liabilities necessarily incurred for the works in question, and that the amount be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to be laid before Parliament at its next Session."

There we have not only a statement in regard to the special warrants and Orders in Council, but setting forth the reasons why these expenditures were made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is in them all.

Mr. WELDON. Not in what is brought down here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but every one of these warrants is founded on an Order in Council in precisely the same terms as the hon. gentleman has read to the House.

Mr. WELDON. I know that, and they can only be issued on an Order in Council, but the report brought down