

year to be paid out of the vote for the following year. \$9,661 was paid in 1880, so that we come in pretty even to this very year in which \$10,000 is required. Now, I turn to the account, and I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the unsatisfactory mode in which the legislation account has been kept for a number of years. We get certain details in the Estimates of that account, but in the Public Accounts you have but a single lump sum given, without details of any kind. For 1877-78 the total amount voted for legislation was \$131,000, which included \$15,000 for the *Hansard*. The charge in the Public Accounts for that year is \$140,000, or \$9,000 in excess of the vote. Now we find that much more than \$9,000 more was expended, for it is alleged that the \$6,393 of *Hansard* money was not expended in that year, therefore there was really expended for the year \$146,000 odd as against the vote of \$131,000. For the next year the vote was \$177,000, and what is charged in the Public Accounts is \$142,914. For the next year \$133,000 is the vote, and there is charged \$174,000. So it seems to me these accounts require some investigation. We find that for these three consecutive years there is a charge in the Public Accounts, as having been spent on account of these votes, more than the whole vote which Parliament gave in each of these years, and aggregating in the three years to no less than \$17,000 of over-expenditure. In addition to that \$17,000 we are now asked for \$10,000 more for *Hansard* during the year. So there seems to have been some irregularity of some description in keeping these accounts, which requires further explanation before we come to concurrence.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman will remember that this matter was brought before the Public Accounts Committee last Session. It has been the custom in the past, if the appropriation for one branch of the service was insufficient and there was a surplus in another branch, that the surplus has been used for the other service. During the present year, and by direction of the Public Accounts Committee, the whole of these accounts passed into the hands of the Auditor-General. The particular item to which attention is now called has been expended under a wrong head, and this is a difficulty that will be obviated in the future under the new system of auditing.

208. To provide for increase of salary to the Deputy Adjutant General in Manitoba \$300 00

Mr. CARON. When Col. Osborne Smith went to Manitoba, he was promised command of the battalion which at that time existed in Winnipeg. Subsequently the battalion was disbanded, but as he had been promised the command, this \$300 was left to him as part of his payment. I may say it is not intended to continue the pay to his successor, Mr. Horton, who is coming from British Columbia to Winnipeg.

209. Contingencies—To provide for gratuities on retirement to the under-mentioned officers:
 Lt.-Col. W. S. Durie, Deputy Adjutant-General, Military District No. 2 \$3,400 00
 Lt.-Col. J. Fletcher, C.M.G., Deputy Adjutant-General, Military District No. 5 3,400 00
 Lt.-Col. J. H. Gray, Deputy Adjutant-General, Military District No. 12..... 1,700 00
 Lt.-Col. J. Moffatt, Brigade-Major, Military District No. 1..... 2,400 00
 To provide for removal allowance to Deputy Adjutants-General and Brigade-Majors..... 5,683 16
 To provide for personal travelling expenses and cost of transport of luggage of each officer..... 1,816 84

Mr. ANGLIN. I suppose this arose from the shifting of the officers lately?

Mr. CARON. Yes. Several of these gentlemen have been several years in the service. Previous to my taking charge of the department, it was decided to remove the different brigade-majors and deputy adjutants-general who had been so long in the different districts, from one district to

another. It became necessary to provide for a number who, by reason of age or some other reason personal to themselves, were not able to accept the offer to remove. In the cases of Col. Moffatt, Col. Durie and Col. Fletcher, the annuity is for two years.

210. Amount required to cover cost of transport of military stores for equipment of Mounted Rifle Companies, organized for the protection of settlers in the North-West \$645 75

Mr. CARON. This is for the transport of military stores by the Hudson's Bay Company from Winnipeg to Fort Carlton.

Mr. BLAKE. When did the transport take place, and under what circumstances was this force organized?

Mr. CARON. Under an Order in Council of the 16th August, 1879.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it in consequence of some Indian scare, or in pursuance of some policy of keeping up a mounted police force for the settlers?

Mr. CARON. At that time there was a good many rumors about of expected trouble among the Indians in that part of the country, and it was considered necessary to have some mounted troops. Of course, it cost very much less to provide for these than it would have cost for the mounted police.

211. *Intercolonial Railway*—Amount required to cover salary of Chief Engineer appointed for the settlement of old claims, salaries of Assistants, travelling expenses, Shorthand Writer, etc..... \$12,000 00

Mr. POPE. This includes the salary of Mr. Frank Shanly, as Chief Engineer, \$6,500; Mr. Ralph Jones, as Secretary, \$1,200; Mr. C. W. Shanly, Secretary, \$600; travelling expenses, telegraphing, &c., \$3,700. This is, of course, for this year.

19. To pay Mr. Girouard, for railway ties lost in transit in 1872 \$2,640 00

Mr. POPE (Compton). The arbitrator, after examining into this matter, decided the claim should be paid.

Mr. ANGLIN. The ties when lost were the property of the contractors. They were being removed, when lost, to the place of delivery, and, therefore, the Government were not responsible.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Did not the official arbitrator refuse to recognize that claim?

Mr. POPE. I have no information about that. Mr. Cowan proved pretty satisfactorily the loss of the sleepers, and produced a letter from Mr. Stevenson to the effect that if Girouard proved the loss, he was entitled to payment.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the same question which was supposed at one time to have affected my seat in Parliament. I was notified that I was to be moved against for having violated the law relating to the independence of Parliament. It has just been stated that Mr. Girouard did not deliver the sleepers where they ought to have been delivered, and therefore he should not have been paid. He clearly established the fact that the sleepers had been delivered and received by the Government; and that it was, after it was so received, found necessary to remove the pieces to another portion of the work, and he was instructed so to remove them. He pointed out the danger to which he would not undertake the work unless the Government held him safe from all loss—on this condition he removed the sleepers. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin), who knows the country, knows also that removing timber from the Bay of Bathurst would be hazardous in rough weather; rough weather did overtake him, and they were blown across to the Canada side and were lost. At the same time Mr. John-