

taken, under this or any other pretext, out of the public Treasury, on grounds which it appears to me the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to show, come either within the letter or the spirit of the Act to which I have alluded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, there can be no possible objection to the motion which the hon. gentleman has made. In fact, I assume that, when the information for which the hon. gentleman has moved comes down, and a comparison is made between these warrants and those which were issued under the Administration of my hon. friend on the other side, it will be found that very little explanation will be required as regards a considerable portion of the remarks he has just addressed to the House. I may say at the outset that I am disposed to concur with the hon. gentleman in the principle he has laid down. I think the warrant of the Governor General should be confined to services which are contemplated by the authority under which that warrant is issued, that is, services which are unforeseen and which it is necessary should be provided for without reference to Parliament. It will be observed that with regard to this very large sum—and it is an abnormally large sum—of over \$2,000,000 comprised in these warrants, the hon. gentleman has not taken exception, as I understand him, to any item in this paper. He has not challenged any one of these expenditures as an improper expenditure. It is quite possible that my hon. colleague behind me may be open to the charge of not having accurately estimated the precise amount which would be required for some of these various services, but I may say that it is not always convenient to make an estimate in regard to matters of that kind. If an estimate which is thus made is a very large estimate it stimulates the parties who are making claims to make those claims commensurate to the estimate. Take the rebellion losses claims, for instance, which were under consideration. The hon. gentleman knows that if Parliament, in advance of the report of the Royal Commission, had provided a very large amount for the settlement of these claims, it would stimulate the parties to put in claims for amounts which, at all events, would cover the appropriation of Parliament. So that I think there is a sufficient reason why it is not desirable, in many of these cases, to anticipate what would be required by an estimate which must be, in the nature of things, very inaccurate and incomplete. The hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House to a number of these items, as to which it will be seen at once that all possible foundation for a criticism of the action of the Government disappears. Take the first item of \$125,631.75. What is that item? The hon. gentleman knows that the Government of which he was a member dispossessed the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company—for whom one of his colleagues exhibited a great deal of sympathy on a recent occasion—of the possession of the Windsor branch—forcibly dispossessed them, took it out of their hands, and placed it in the hands of another company. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, under a petition of right, took an action—as they were entitled to do—against the Government of Canada for that act; and the Government—the successors of hon. gentlemen opposite—felt bound to resist in all its stages the claim which was made, and the verdict which was secured against the Government with regard to that claim. But when the time came, when the last appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had gone against Canada, I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that, under those circumstances, when it was found that they were entitled by the verdict of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to a certain amount, he will agree with me that there should be no unnecessary delay in paying them a claim which was raised so long ago as the period when the hon. gentleman was in office, a claim which was founded

on the act of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. I think it will not be necessary that I should occupy the time of the House any longer in relation to that question. I will also pass over the Banff Hot Springs, as I hope the information afforded to the House yesterday in regard to that matter will be considered sufficient to make it unnecessary for me to add anything to the full and complete explanations which were then given. The fact is that the Government were led to believe by gentlemen on both sides of the House that it was very important that steps should be taken in regard to that question; and having decided to set aside that locality as a public park, the needful steps were instituted by the Government for the purpose of ascertaining precisely what would require to be done. Parliament not being in Session, they considered that it was not desirable that any time should be lost in developing the springs and making them valuable to all classes of people who might resort to them for the benefits they would afford. Steps were accordingly taken, and in order to avoid the loss of a year, the grant was anticipated and a warrant was obtained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will observe that the larger portion of that was after Parliament was in Session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was April the 14th, but the order was passed before that. I may say that I quite agree with the hon. gentleman on the question of law, because it seems to be explicit, but the Order in Council was passed previous to the meeting of Parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How long previous.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A very short time previous; but the hon. gentleman will see that it was to cover expenditures already made and that there would be considerable delay in meeting it, unless it was met by the warrant of the Governor General. No Order in Council for any warrant contained in this list was passed by Council after the meeting of Parliament. Then the hon. gentleman did not say much in regard to the question of compensation for losses arising out of the rebellion in the North-West Territories, and very naturally, because he would at once perceive that the Government would be bound promptly to provide for losses, if there were any. If there was any case which could possibly justify the issue of the Governor General's warrant, it would be a case of that kind, in which it was found that individuals had suffered—as they did suffer—in consequence of that unfortunate rebellion. Therefore I think you will agree with me that no unnecessary time should be allowed to lapse between the finding of the commission and the payment of the relief to the parties who are the claimants. Then, the salaries and expenses of commissioners on the rebellion losses could not be very well estimated until the work was closed, and it had been found what amount of time, labor and expense had been involved in performing that important duty. The hon. gentleman has made no remark in regard to the consolidation of the Statutes, because that is a lapsed balance for which Parliament had provided, and which forms an item of \$24,772.30. The Royal Commission on Railways was also authorized by this House. I do not, perhaps, sympathise so very much with that appropriation, from the fact that while I had the honor of occupying the position of Minister of Railways I opposed the efforts that were being made in that direction; but the House came to the conclusion that it was desirable to have that whole question examined by a Royal Commission, and provision, of course, had to be made for it. Then, the amount of \$163,938.83 for expenses of the rebellion in the North-West Territories is also a lapsed balance, and the hon. gentleman will agree that having had the sanction of Parliament before—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did state that.