

the resolution is sufficiently large to embrace this Bill in its present form.

Mr. POPE. I think the resolution was broad enough to cover the money I am asking from the House. I explained to the House at the time, that the estimated cost of this road, over and above the subsidies already granted, was about \$1,000,000. When we want more we shall come to the House, as we always do, and ask for it. But I think the resolution covers all we are asking for now.

Mr. BLAKE. I think not. The resolution proposed that a certain sum of money should be granted, half a million, I think, and the unexpended sum of a former subsidy for the construction of a railway. That is the purpose. The Bill proposes that an indefinite sum should be applied towards the reimbursement or the purchase of certain work. There has been no information in the committee as to the application of any portion of the public money for that purpose; there is, therefore, no proper foundation for a disbursement of public money for that purpose. One purpose for which the committee authorised the disbursement of public money was for the building of the road.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman is quite right. It was for the building of the road, and this is as much a part of the building of the road as the rest of the work we have to do, and I think was covered by the resolution. I explained at the time—

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. POPE. I explained at the time that we might have to pay something, or we might have to pay nothing; I could not say. But if there was anything that fairly belonged to the company, I wanted authority by this Act to be able to pay them.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no recollection of any such explanation of the hon. gentleman, and I am quite convinced the resolution does not cover any proposal to pay any private individual one sixpence for money or work already done upon that railway. I believe, in point of law, there is no claim on the part of this company for one sixpence from this Government, and every sixpence that is paid to the company will be a gift. It may be a right thing to give the money, it may be a wrong thing, but the question of the moment is whether the resolution authorised that disposition of the public moneys. The hon. gentleman's explanation, according to my recollection of it, was confined to the proposition that he was about to build and to pay for building, not to buy and pay for buying, the works already constructed.

Mr. THOMPSON. The resolution, I think, is pretty explicit. It reads:

"Resolved, That it is expedient that the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow should be completed as a Government railway, and that, in addition to any unexpended balance of the sum of \$224,000 granted as a subsidy for the construction of the said railway by the Act 45th Victoria, chapter 14, there shall be granted to Her Majesty, for the said purpose, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, a sum of five hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. BLAKE. That is to complete the railway.

Mr. THOMPSON. Precisely, to complete the railway. Now, as I explained before you left the Chair at six o'clock, the Government at present, although some work has been done in connection with this railway, own no part of it. There is an outstanding mortgage to those who are trustees for the creditors, and it is anticipated that the mortgage in which the Government are interested, will be foreclosed, and under that, in all probabilities, the work may be acquired; or it may be that that mortgage being satisfied, or released, or foreclosure being impossible, it may be necessary to expropriate the works of the company in order to acquire the right of way for the railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The resolution does not sustain the position taken by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Justice. The resolution says that it is expedient that the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow should be completed as a Government railway, and that, in addition to any unexpended balance granted as subsidy by the Act 45 Victoria, chapter 14, there should be granted out of any unappropriated moneys of the Consolidated Fund, \$500,000. This is for the purpose of completing this particular undertaking as a Government railway. So far from it being suggested that any portion might be diverted for the purpose the hon. gentleman has mentioned, the suggestion is that there is a portion of the \$224,000 unexpended, and it might be applied to carrying forward the construction of the line and completing the undertaking. If the hon. gentleman proposes to apply the money to any other purpose, it should be stated in the resolution, and it is not so stated. I should like it to be decided whether the Bill in its present form can go before the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. I contend that the resolution contains very distinct language with respect to the appropriation of the amounts named, and that it is impossible they can be diverted to any other purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER. I rule that the expenditure provided for in the Bill is covered by the resolution, and if the hon. gentleman desires to offer any objection it can be done much better in Committee of the Whole, when a motion can be made that the objectionable portion be struck out of the Bill. I, therefore, see no objection to the Bill being read the second time.

Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—REVISION OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House again resolve itself in Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the following telegram, which, it is said in a newspaper I hold in my hand, was received by the revising officer of a county in the Island of Prince Edward:

"Geo. D. Allen, revising officer for Queen's, has received the following telegram:

"OTTAWA, 26th May, 1887.

"To——, revising officer for —— county:

"A measure will be submitted to Parliament concerning revision of lists. Do not incur any expenditure, nor proceed with any work. Will further instruct you later.

"J. A. CHAPLEAU,

"Secretary of State."

It seems to me that this telegram, if sent by a member of the Government to the revising officers throughout the country, is a gross violation of the law of the land. There is no rule better settled since the days of Charles the Second than that the Government have neither dispensing nor suspending power. The Government in this case have undertaken to instruct officers who are appointed for the purpose of discharging certain duties mentioned in the law. Whether the law was wise or unwise, it is a law that was carried through Parliament and received the sanction of the Crown, and it is the duty of those who are appointed under the law to act in accordance with its provisions and to give effect to its provisions. If they are found to be unwise and not in the public interest, it is the duty of the Government charged with the administration of public affairs to submit to this House a measure amending that particular statute. We find that the Government, instead of undertaking to discharge that duty, instead of coming down to this House with a measure to amend the law and remedy any defect, have assumed to do what they have on authority whatever to do, to instruct various important