

Mr. MITCHELL. Let my hon. friend bear in mind that one of the strong points I made in that discussion was this: that, on a question of that kind, I appealed to the House—and I am in the memory of hon. gentlemen who know that what I am saying is true—I appealed to the House that, in a question in which the public interests and the public health might be so possibly concerned, in the future as well as at present, we ought not to mix up a mere political or constitutional or financial question, with what I conceived should be dealt with in a sanitary point of view. I appeal to hon. gentlemen if that was not the stand I took; and when the Finance Minister imputed to me that I had changed my attitude on this question he was entirely wrong. My reference to the fact that the *tu quoque* argument was used did not refer to what was said by the Minister of Finance, but referred to a statement made by the Minister of Fisheries to this House; and when I got up I said that, while it might be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite to attack hon. gentlemen on this side, and say: "You did it, too," and while it might be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen on this side to make use of the same kind of argument towards the opposite party—that while this might be satisfactory to the two great political parties, I occupied an independent position in this House, and it was not satisfactory to me, and I did not think it would be satisfactory to the country. Now, I have never dealt with the question of the Governor General's warrants. I merely made an incidental reference to the question for the purpose of trying to keep the two sides of the House right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I am glad my hon. friends approve, by their cheers and applause, of the position I have assumed. I know there is justice enough on both sides of the House to appreciate a correct position when it is stated, as I have stated it on this question. When the hon. the Finance Minister was speaking, I asked his permission to allow me to make the suggestion that he was misrepresenting me when he made that statement. But he was so carried away with his own eloquence and the powerful arguments with which he was extinguishing an hon. gentleman on this side—his former predecessor—that he would not permit an explanation, and I had to wait to the close of his forcible and powerful speech until I had an opportunity of explaining myself. I repeat again that I did not deal with the question of the Governor's warrants. I made only an incidental reference to it when I defended the policy of the Government in relation to the Banff Springs; and when I made the remarks, which he was pleased to describe in the way he did, I spoke by way of an appeal to the House to dis sever the question of financial interests, as created by the outlay for the Banff Springs—which he says is the most indefensible expenditure of the whole lot of them—from the sanitary question which was then before the House. I never dealt with the manner of spending the money or the amounts said to be expended; but when the question of preserving a great natural remedy, and what would prove to be a great health resort in the future, was before the House, I applauded the Government for the fact that, while they owned that territory and before it got complicated by the claims of private individuals, as had occurred in other places to my knowledge—I applauded them for taking control of these grounds, and asked the House to dis sever the financial interest from the sanitary one, and deal with it purely on the principle of the Bill which the Minister of the Interior had introduced, giving him ample power to carry out a measure which so fully met with my approval, and which, I was sure, would be approved of by a majority of the House. When I referred to the *tu quoque* argument, my hon. friend was wrong in charging me with mixing up the two questions. I wanted to dis sever them; I endeavored to do so, and my attitude will be, I think, in the

Mr. MITCHELL.

recollection of the House, and the Minister of Finance did wrong in attempting to put me in the wrong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The \$20,000 to which the hon. gentleman referred as having been paid illegally and irregularly, although for a desirable object—the relief of the sufferers by the St. John fire—I find was charged, and I think correctly charged, in the accounts of 1877, to the \$50,000 for unforeseen expenses, which we had the authority to expend.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will find, on further investigation, that he is entirely mistaken. I would like to ask him, if it was charged to the \$50,000, why it was necessary on the 25th of June, 1877, to have an Order in Council to appropriate the \$20,000?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly, I had no right, nor has the hon. gentleman any right, of his own proper motion, without the authority of the Governor General in Council, to spend any part of the \$50,000. I think he will find that is so, if he consults his advisers.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman think that any individual Minister has the right to cheek out \$50,000 on his own individual authority?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly not.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it must be done by an Order in Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But I think he will find that it was for the construction of buildings.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is unforeseen expenses of any kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is getting rusty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to make a remark or two with regard to the observations addressed to the House by the Finance Minister. I think the hon. gentleman has to some extent misapprehended the position I took yesterday, with regard to the same question. The hon. gentleman said there was a difference of opinion between the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and myself: Now, that is a mistake. I cordially subscribed to the view put forward by the hon. member for South Oxford, but, because my hon. friend did not discuss certain expenditures of the Government to the extent he might have done, the hon. gentleman assumes that my hon. friend from South Oxford did not call in question the propriety of those expenditures. Then the hon. gentleman's friends took another position which I commented upon, but to which the hon. gentleman has to some extent misrepresented—perhaps unintentionally—but nevertheless the hon. gentleman has not correctly represented the statement I made. Now the hon. gentleman and his friends took this position. He said if an appropriation had once been made it was quite right and proper for the Government, subsequently, notwithstanding the fact that it had lapsed, to provide by Governor's warrants for that expenditure. It was that general proposition that I called in question, and I pointed out that the Act provided that the Administration might extend the period beyond the period of the year for which it was voted, for a period of three months, and that if it were in the power of the Government to extend the period indefinitely then such a provision of the law was altogether unnecessary, and in fact altogether inoperative. Therefore it was impossible to put the construction on the law which the hon. gentleman had put upon it. Now, an appropriation once made by Parlia-