

\$4,767, to complete the buildings. Carleton Branch Railway capital, to pay for outstanding stock, \$3,000. The Liquor License Act, to refund fees, \$25,000. The amount of \$70,000 in connection with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition is due to the fact that the expenditure considerably exceeded what we hoped at an earlier period would have covered the cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When did that close?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The exhibition closed about the 11th November. Of course the closing of the exhibition and getting rid of the exhibits which filled such an enormous space as we were able to fill in that exhibition, are two very different things, and it required a large amount of expenditure, under the arrangement which had been made by the Government, to dispose of the exhibits after the close. The experimental farm had also received the approval of Parliament, and the appropriation of \$25,000 for that was to carry out the arrangements submitted to and sanctioned by Parliament. The \$189,113 for the Indians in Manitoba, North West Territories and British Columbia was, of course, unforeseen, the amount required to meet the necessity in that case having very far exceeded the amount anticipated by the hon. the First Minister, who has charge of that Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And whose attention I called to the probable estimate at the time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman having called the attention of the Head of the Department to the fact of its being a moderate estimate, would be better prepared to excuse the necessity of the Governor General's warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite the reverse. I cannot agree with that logic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The next item is Quarantine: compensation to owners of cattle to prevent the spread of pneumonia, \$39,256. This arises from the great misfortune created in pleuro-pneumonia having broken out in the quarantine station at Lévis, and to the prompt and energetic measures necessary to be taken—measures which have had the effect of instantaneously stamping out all possible extension of the disease in this country, and thus enabling us to continue to enjoy the security we do. This security makes the expenditure, great as it is, appear very insignificant, compared with the very important purpose for which it was provided. I am certain the House will agree with me that this was entirely an unforeseen expenditure, and one which I hope will not soon occur again. Ocean and River Service and Dominion Steamers, \$14,000, arises from the fact that this service which Parliament had authorised exceeded by this sum the amount appropriated. I quite agree with the principle which the hon. gentleman has laid down, that the Governor General's warrants should never be resorted to in any case in which it is possible to obtain the consent of Parliament, without great inconvenience to the public service, and I hope, when the papers he has moved for are brought down, to find a great deal of justification in the practice of the Administration of which the hon. gentleman had the honor of being Finance Minister.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise now mainly to call the attention of the House, after the explanations given by the Finance Minister, to a single item in this list; but before doing so I may say in reply to the hon. the Finance Minister, that it would be very desirable now, in order to avoid the recurrence of such a statement as this, which certainly presents a very abnormal amount of money drawn from the Treasury without the action of the people's representatives having been had upon it—I say it would be very desirable for the

hon. gentleman in future to get accurate statements as far as possible from the different Departments. Either they are to blame in not putting in such amounts as would cover their probable expenditure, or the officer who made up the Budget must have understated these amounts, and, therefore, misled the House in making the expenditure of the year apparently less than was actually required. With regard to a single item in this, I propose to criticise the action of the Government. The Minister of Public Works has given an explanation of this. The item is a warrant issued on the 10th January, under the head of Public Works—Arbitrations and Awards, to pay Call, Sadler & Co. for the loss of the tug *Sultan*, \$8,000. The hon. gentleman says there was an award made by the Dominion arbitrators, and that these gentlemen awarded this amount to Messrs. Call, Sadler & Co. for the loss of the tug *Sultan*, but that, as they claimed more, and the Government were going to contest the award, they accepted that amount. I know the circumstances of this case, and I will give them a little more fully. This tug *Sultan* was employed on behalf of the Government to do certain service, and during the season to transport tugs and scows between Prince Edward Island and a port in Nova Scotia. A Government officer was on board that tug, the Government officer was in charge of that tug, and the captain of the tug took his instructions from that Government officer. The proprietors of the tug had the Government officer effect an insurance upon a particular voyage on which that tug was engaged, but, while at sea, and after proceeding on the voyage to transport these vessels from one port to the other, the Government agent altered the order of transportation and changed the voyage, and so vitiated the policy of insurance, and then the vessel was lost. When a claim was made on the insurance company, the fact came out that, by direction of the officer of the Government, who was on board and in charge of the tug, the voyage had been deviated from, and the insurance company obtained a non-suit before the Circuit Court in Northumberland. I think this occurred eight or nine years ago. I am not sure about the time, but I know it was a long time ago, more than five years at any rate. The firm applied to the Government for compensation, which the Government refused to give them. The matter went through my hands. I did my level best to induce the Government to come to some arrangement, but they would not do it. I tried to get them to refer it to arbitration, but that was refused year after year. I will, however, say this for the Minister of Public Works, under whose charge the matter was, that he was always impressed with the justice of the claim, and that I never found more fair consideration given to any claims that I had to press upon the Government than was always given by him as head of a Department; and I do not impute to him anything improper or any act of injustice in connection with this transaction. At last, I got the matter referred to arbitration, I think something like fifteen or sixteen months ago. The arbitrators sat upon it, I think some fourteen or probably fifteen months ago. I think it was in December twelve months, some time near Christmas. They awarded \$8,000 to Messrs. Call, Sadler & Co. After that award was made, I had occasion to wait on the Department in order to endeavor to get the amount paid, or to get it put in the Estimates of last year. I was told by the Minister that he would have to submit it to Council. I understood that the decision of Council was that they were determined to contest the claim, and the amount was not put in the Estimates last year. So the matter stood. Peter Mitchell was out of favor with the Administration. He had the courage of his convictions. He had the courage, when he differed with the Administration, to say so. Consequently, although this was a just and equitable claim, which had been passed on by the Dominion arbitrators, I could not get a sum put in