

ments laid on the Table—which the Minister of Finance says, however, does not include all the items—out of \$2,313,000, only \$239,000 are put down as lapsed balances, and I do not think there can be found any just ground for excusing the use of warrants for two millions and a half under the circumstances. However, if there are, the hon. gentlemen are perfectly welcome to all the advantage they can derive from it. I took occasion to point out that there were certain circumstances under which the Governor General's warrant could be properly used, and I did not blame the Government for using them. I think, for instance, such a case as the slaughter of cattle in quarantine was a proper and legitimate subject for the use of a Governor General's warrant. What I objected to then, and what I continue to object to, is the vicious practice of allowing the Department to under-estimate the sums required, and to supplement the deficiency by Governor General's warrants. I do not think, in the three years I have alluded to, the hon. gentleman can fairly point to any such cases—and they constitute, in the majority of cases, the points to which I took objection with respect to these other large expenditures. Now, Sir, I think it will be eminently in the public interest, and I think it will be a very proper thing, that the Committee on Public Accounts be allowed to investigate the circumstances under which these several warrants have been issued; and I take the opportunity of repeating the suggestion I made already, that in matters where money is expended without the authority of Parliament it would be convenient and proper that, at the time these warrants are laid on the Table of Parliament, accompanying them should be copies of the several orders and reports under which they were obtained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not usual, is it?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I am not censuring the present Minister of Finance for that, but I think it is desirable the practice should be so. I think that every reasonable care should be used when an extraordinary power is exercised, that the House should be put in possession of all the details at the earliest possible moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I intend to occupy the attention of the House but for a few moments on this matter, and I would not have said a single word if this discussion had been confined to the position to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) left it when he made the previous motion. I not only took no exception to that motion, but I concurred, as I now do, in the principle that he laid down as a sound constitutional maxim, that the expenditure of public money by warrant of the Governor General should be entirely exceptional, that it should be used for the purpose of providing, after Parliament has risen, for expenditures that were obviously necessary and required. I certainly, however, took no exception to the criticisms which the hon. gentleman found it his duty to make, and which I am quite sure he did make under a sense of public duty, with reference to the expenditures under the warrant of the Governor General, and detailed in the paper which we laid upon the Table of the House. Had the discussion rested there, I am quite certain we would all have been as one as to the desirability of carrying out in every possible way the objects which the mover of the resolution stated to be his, in bringing the subject under the attention of the House, and that was to draw the attention of the Government and of Parliament to the necessity of strictly confining the expenditure to the purposes to which the law provided that the warrant of a Governor General should be used, and that is, a demand for public money during the recess of Parliament, and the neglect to provide which would be attended with great inconvenience to the public service. I stated in the outset that I had not time or opportunity to investigate the matter before the hon. gentleman made his motion, nor did I

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

know the line he proposed to take; but I referred to the action of the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power, and to the action of the hon. gentleman himself when he was Finance Minister, to show that the same practice to which he had taken exception had been adopted and found necessary by them. But, Sir, the discussion would not have taken the wider range that it did take, had not the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) taken the ground that the Finance Minister, who was his colleague, had entirely failed to discharge his duty as Finance Minister in the House, when he held that position. I referred to the expenditure that had been made under Governor General's warrants—not to show that they were wrong; I took no exception to them, they may be entirely within the category, in my judgment, of necessary expenditures. I say, therefore, I did not join issue with the hon. gentleman, but I simply alluded to the practice that had prevailed, and said I was quite certain when all these papers were brought down, that it would be found that the present Government had ample justification, that the course they had pursued was the course adopted by the hon. gentleman when he was Finance Minister himself. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) intimated that the Government were adopting a *tu quoque* argument in order to shelter themselves from wrong-doing, by saying: You have done so, also. My argument was not brought forward in that spirit. It was brought forward to show that the explanations which had been offered in reference to the items contained in the paper laid before the House were sufficient, and that the items not only in themselves were proper, but that they were justified by the practice of the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power. That is a legitimate argument, it is not a *tu quoque* argument, it is not a justification of a wrong on the ground that some person else has done a similar wrong. I deny there is any wrong in the case. I say the warrants contained in the papers laid on the Table, so far as I am able to judge, were properly required, they were necessary in the public interest, and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has given a very vigorous and eloquent defense of the most objectionable item, if that term may be applied to any of the items, contained in the whole—that is the item for the appropriation of the park at Banff. I am free to say that the case, in my judgment, is not so strong for that expenditure by Governor General's warrant, although it is strong enough to justify it, as it is for almost all, if not all, the others; and as the member for Northumberland has eloquently defended the only weak point in our case, I was rather surprised to find him charging us with using a *tu quoque* argument and justifying ourselves for wrong-doing by saying that somebody else had done an equal wrong.

Mr. MITCHELL. Allow me to put you right.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to conclude, as I have only a few words to say, and I am afraid if I allow the interposition of the eloquent declamation of the hon. member for Northumberland, I may be so far carried away as to be thrown off the track.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was simply because you were representing me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), took the ground that there was no one of those expenditures so indefensible, so utterly in violation of the statute, as a Governor General's warrant for a lapsed balance, the discussion took a wider range, and, of course, it was right for the Minister of Justice to point out that it was not open to the member for Bothwell to take that ground, as the Minister of Finance of the Government with whom he had served, had adopted exactly the same principle, and had brought down lapsed balances by the half-dozen, at the very least, consequently sweeping away that argument. I do not intend to detain the House