

of the Northwest Mounted Police is strongly of the opinion that the majority of them have done so. The loss of strength due to the release of men at the expiration of their engagement was so serious that I was obliged to address a special appeal to all ranks with the view of retaining their services in Canada. The present authorized strength of the force is 1,200, exclusive of officers, but the actual strength of all ranks on 3rd August was 742 only, and the commissioner is now actively engaged in an endeavour to bring the force up to the authorized strength above quoted.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: This vote of \$260,000 is made necessary by the fact that on January 1, 1917, the Mounted Police were released from duty in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba and on March 1 from duty in the province of Alberta. This meant a loss of revenue to the police, on account of the subsidies that were received from these provinces being withdrawn, as follows:

Subsidies from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba for the fiscal year 1917-18 not now available on account of the release of the Northwest Mounted Police from the duty of the maintenance of law and order in those provinces	\$155,000
Refunds not now available for the causes above referred to	\$92,500

These refunds were on account of amounts paid for patrols and escorts, etc., of convicts and lunatics that were paid out of police funds and afterwards refunded by the provinces to the police. The balance is an item of \$12,500, which, the commissioner states, is necessary for one hundred remounts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not exactly apprehend the explanation. The House is asked to vote \$260,000 additional to what has been voted already. As I understand the explanation, there is no addition to the amount of money really voted and to be expended, but that this is simply to make up the amount of money which was paid by the three provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan for the protection of the police. This money, as I always understood, was paid into the consolidated fund and was not expended by the police themselves. I do not understand why we are called on to vote more money because we receive less revenue. That is not the spirit of the Act or of our financial system. The principle is that money is voted here and is expended here, and any revenues go into the consolidated fund. This year we shall receive less money and

[Sir Robert Borden.]

so we shall have less to expend, the expenditure will be reduced because the police force which was employed in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan will no longer be employed there, as the Provincial Governments will have to look after their own police work.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: The amount asked for in the main estimates was \$1,513,169. From this amount the sum of \$355,000 was deducted, which represented the subsidies that we received from these three provinces as well as refunds, leaving a net amount required of \$1,158,169. As I said, on 1st of January and 1st March, the police were released from duty by the provinces, and consequently the subsidies stopped, and a considerable portion of the \$355,000 that we used to receive will, of course, not now be available.

In January, 1917, when the commissioner sent down his estimates, while these estimates were made after the change was made by the provinces. These figures did not reach the Minister of Finance in time to go into the main estimates, and the amount of \$260,000 is required to make up the difference.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But it does not make it up. My hon. friend asks for \$1,300,000 in the main estimates for subsidies, subsistence, billeting, forage, dog feed, fuel, light, clothing, etc.—that is, for the general expenses of the police. Now he asks for \$262,000 more for the same purpose. He is authorized to spend by this not only \$1,300,000 but over \$1,500,000. It is no answer to tell us there is less revenue; that is no explanation at all. Whether there is less or more revenue does not matter. Do we require this amount for these purposes? I could understand my honourable friend saying that owing to the increased cost of all commodities this increased amount was necessary, but certainly it is no explanation to tell us that we have less revenue than we had before.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: I am sorry I have not made myself plain. I said that the amount required was \$1,513,169; but that, on account of this new arrangement, this had been reduced by the amount of \$355,000 which we used to receive from these sources.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That does not help the situation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If there is any difficulty we shall let this stand so as to have a full explanation. It would appear