

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I think so; but as my hon. friend will see, it all goes to make up that large total of \$2,000,000, and shows that for a considerable portion of that amount there was actually the previous vote and approval of Parliament. So, with reference to seed grain for settlers, I believe there is no question that, if it was found necessary to give relief of that kind, it should be dealt with as an unforeseen expenditure. So with regard to the relief of distressed settlers at Prince Albert and Batoche. Therefore I think this sum of \$136,679 is one to which no objection will be raised, and I think it will be admitted that it was right and proper that a Governor General's warrant should be obtained in order that relief should be afforded. The Royal Commission on Lachine Canal leases was a matter that would necessarily have to be provided for. The Bow River bridge in the North-West Territories was found to be very much demanded, and as this was a case in which the Government were led to believe that delay would be attended with great inconvenience, the expenditure was warrantable. The compensation for sinking the barge *Williams* in the Lachine Canal was entitled to be granted, it having been found that the Government had damaged those parties to the amount of \$2,638.79. Then the sum of \$10,264 is a lapsed balance, which had received the approval of Parliament, for a return to persons in Prince Edward Island of the amount of duties paid to the United States Customs on fish and fish oils. The next item is a small amount of a savings bank account paid to the surviving executor of the late George Wilson. The only item in the whole of this long and rather formidable list to which the hon. gentleman took very decided exception was \$4,000 to pay the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company costs in the suit of the Queen, represented by the Ontario Government, against that company. But the hon. gentleman will be greatly relieved to learn that that expenditure had received the approval of Parliament, and is among the lapsed balances, although it is not so stated here. Then, we have next a number of items connected with the Department of Public Works, in reference to which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will, doubtless, as he is always able to do, give the most minute, specific, and satisfactory information. The expenditure of \$25,460 for Mounted Police buildings is also in the category of lapsed balances, having been approved and previously voted by Parliament. The expenditure of \$18,000 on the Negro Point breakwater, at St. John, was, I suppose in consequence of its being carried away by a storm or something of that kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one item in the Public Works Department which the hon. gentleman has passed over—arbitrations and awards—to pay Messrs. Call, Sadler & Co., for loss of tug *Sultan*, \$8,000, on January 10th, 1877. I should like to know what great urgency there was for that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was in consequence of an award. The award was contested by the Government, but the parties wanted a larger amount than this. They wanted interest as well, and finally they agreed, in order that their case might be settled, to take the \$8,000 without costs or interest, and a Governor's warrant was obtained for the amount.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The next item of \$5,000, for rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway, it will at once be seen, arose from the hope on the part of the Government when Parliament was in Session that they would not be required to increase the rolling stock, and a sufficient vote for that service was not taken; but it was found during the year that the great increase in business, especially the greatly increased demand for coal cars, made it an absolute necessity to have this increased amount for that purpose. The land claims and damages on the St. Charles Branch, to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the amount of \$222,091.46, to which my hon. friend also took very decided objection, will at once, I am sure, be recognised as warranted by the fact that the awards of the arbitrators were resisted by the Government. They refused to pay those awards to the parties, took the case into the Exchequer Court, and this amount was to pay the judgment of the Exchequer Court against the Government, and was consequently one which it was impossible to avoid. The expenditures amounting in all to \$264,000, for the Halifax Extension, the Dartmouth Branch, the Dalhousie Branch, the Rivière du Loup Branch, the Pictou Branch, the Indian-town Branch, air brakes and sleeping cars, were expenditures that became due under the authority which Parliament had granted for proceeding with those works, and, of course, there was no possible means of avoiding payment as the work was done and the money became due. The largest proportion of that amount had been voted by Parliament, and had lapsed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It ought to have been, but I may say I have been so very closely occupied as not to have given, perhaps, the personal attention I should have to this paper; but the bulk of that amount of \$264,000 should appear as a lapsed balance, which it is practically. Then the payment to Mr. Onderdonk for slides in British Columbia arises from the fact, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the railway there had been constructed through an exceedingly difficult country, and it has been found impossible to avoid very serious landslides. After the track had been completed and everything done according to specification, it was not unusual to have serious landslides occurring. I saw myself in that locality, on the Fraser, a case in which a large portion of a farm was one day on one side of the river and the next morning on the other side, with some of the buildings and constructions upon it not having been disturbed. In regard to the Franchise Act, that Act involved an expenditure of \$100,000, and, as my hon. friend knows, that also had the approval of Parliament. It was expenditure incurred carrying out the Act which Parliament, after full, careful and exhaustive discussion, had decided it was necessary should become law. Then there is the expenditure on the canals, repairs to Port Colborne and Port Maitland harbor works, Welland and Chambly Canals. The hon. gentleman knows repairs have to be made occasionally, and these repairs, amounting to \$23,661, had to be provided for.

Mr. POPE. They were owing to a very heavy storm.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were the result of an exceptionally severe storm which involved the absolute necessity of immediate expenditure to relieve the damage. The House will see this was a case of unforeseen expenditure which we could not avoid providing for. Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, St. John, N.B., and ports in the Basin of Minas, \$2,000. This arose from an error in not having put in the amount which it was agreed between this Government and the Government of Nova Scotia should be provided for, and that error required to be corrected by warrant. The next item, \$2,016, mail subsidy from Campbellton to Gaspé, is also a lapsed balance, provided for by Parliament, but which had not been paid over at the time the amount lapsed. So with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway's suspense account, to pay the Grand Trunk Railway for fuel and the North Shore Railway, at the time of the transfer to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, \$35,373. It was not known under the contract what money would be required to be paid when the claim should be established, and the claim was not established during the Session of Parliament. The Province of Manitoba debt account, was a settlement in full of all claims in connection with the contract of J. A. Gellay & Co., for the Parliament Buildings, Winnipeg, in which the amount provided was exceeded by