

must say that when my hon. friend from Northumberland and other members consider the dates at which these orders were given, being respectively the 11th of March and the 17th of March, it may occur to them that other causes than the destitution of the settlers governed the grant of \$115,000 to these unfortunate people. So, Sir, similarly, although there may be a cause for it, I have my doubts whether the expenditure of the 25th of January, 1887, of \$10,000 for relief to the sufferers by the flood in the town of Cornwall, would have been so freely granted by the hon. gentleman opposite if there had not been some considerable doubt as to how the town of Cornwall would go at the approaching elections. But, Sir, I think, for many reasons, that the appropriation which I see further down of \$4,000 to the St. Catharine Milling and Lumber Company, costs in the suit of the Queen represented by the Ontario Government against that company, is one of the last things that should have been passed without reference to this House, and full discussion here. Coming to larger matters I find that in spite of the large grants made for the service of the Intercolonial Railway, enormous sums have been appropriated for various purposes—\$85,000 for rolling stock; a grant on February 18, 1887, of \$150,000 for land claims and damages for the St. Charles Branch. That, also, is a suggestive item. The sum of \$150,000 was paid for land damages for the St. Charles Branch on Feb., 18th, and a little later \$72,000 more, making in all \$222,000 paid for those land claims and damages. I cannot conceive why Parliament, which was shortly about to assemble, should not have been consulted on this subject, and why the required sum should not have been obtained here. I also fail to understand why such a large sum of money as \$20,000 for the Pictou Town Branch, and a large sum of money for other expenditures on the Intercolonial, amounting in all to \$264,000, should have been required to have been expended in three months. In all about \$600,000 has been expended by Governor General's warrant, without the authority of Parliament, on the Intercolonial alone. The reason why, on the 10th and 16th November, under the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$30,000 were paid to A. Onderdonk for removing slides, I cannot say, and I shall be glad to have an explanation. Then I come, on 4th January, to a warrant for \$100,000 for the Franchise Act. I venture to say that the exercise of common foresight and prudence on the part of those charged with the working of that Act, might have judged that this sum would have been required, and that a vote should have been taken for it. Why the vote was not taken is probably clearly apparent. It was the object to minimise the expenditure under that Act, and therefore a smaller sum was demanded than that which was pointed out on this side of the House would be needed, and which hon. gentlemen knew, was likely to be required. It will be remembered that last year an attempt was made to cut down the expenditure for Dominion lands both on capital and income; and, I fancy, as a result of that, \$101,000 more were demanded for that service—and again I think a very little prudence and foresight on the part of the officers of the Department would have led them to inform the Government what sum was really required, and prevented the Government having recourse to this extraordinary means of meeting it. Later on I find on 14th April the Governor General's warrant was issued for about \$25,000 for an experimental farm, \$189,113 for expenses of Indians in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, and about \$53,000 for other purposes. With respect to the expenditure for Indians I have two remarks to make. First of all, I think it reflects seriously on the Department that they should be unable to estimate within \$200,000 what sum will be required during a period of about nine months. But there is another and I think a graver question involved in regard to these charges. I find there are no less than twelve charges, involving in all an amount of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

\$423,000, very nearly half a million of dollars, which were paid by Governor General's warrant, according to the statement laid on Table, on 14th April, this House having met on 13th April. It appears to me—the Minister of Justice is in his place, and he can correct me if I misread the Act—that this is clearly illegal. The words under which Governor General's warrants are authorised to issue read as follows:—

“If when Parliament is not in Session”——

Now, I cannot understand how it was legal, after the use of such a phrase in the Statute which gives the authority, and after Parliament met on 13th April, how it was constitutional or proper in any way that while this Parliament was sitting here, the Government, by Governor General's warrant, should take \$423,000 for different purposes out of the public Treasury. I shall be glad to hear from the Minister of Justice, if I am incorrect in this interpretation; but it appears to me, taking merely the statute, and reading it as it stands, that here there has been a distinct illegal procedure, wholly apart from the question of the advisability of the practice. With respect to a very great number of those items I desire to call the attention of the House, on both sides, to the fact that it is a most useless farce for us to go through the discussion of Estimates night after night if we find that when the Government have brought down their Estimates, and stated that they require thirty-four or thirty-five millions, as the case may be, for the public service, the Government can, when our backs are turned, by Governor General's warrants take \$2,300,000 out of the public chest and expend it for a variety of purposes. Some of those purposes may be justifiable, some may be good enough, but it appears to me to prove conclusively one of two things: either the various Departments did not fully understand their business, and made exceedingly loose estimates of the sums likely to be required, or else the Government, for certain reasons of their own, saw fit to refuse to listen to the reports of the Departments and placed smaller sums in the Estimates than were really required. Moreover, there is, I think, a special reason why attention should be called to this particular series of items. Those items were mostly taken out of the public chest at the time of the general elections, at a time when hon. gentlemen opposite could not know, unless they possessed the spirit of prophecy, whether they possessed the confidence of the country and would be sustained by the incoming Parliament or not. Under any circumstances, I think the practice is most objectionable, but it is doubly and trebly objectionable when it occurs prior to a general election, and when, as a number of these payments show, those sums were paid in certain constituencies within a few days of the time at which the voters went to the polls. I may be wrong in my reading of the law, although the law appears very clear and distinct, and although I quite clearly recollect under what circumstances Governor General's warrants in days gone by were usually issued. But it does appear to me that under colorable pretext, and even without any pretext at all, the law as laid down in the Consolidated Statutes, at all events, has been openly and boldly violated; and, I repeat, that there does not appear to be any escape from this alternative, either that the various Departments have made very gross under-estimates of the sums required, or else their estimates have not been attended to but kept back, and this number of Governor General's warrants was issued to cover very large sums which it was not convenient to allow to appear in the Estimates of last year. I will only say, in conclusion, that I cannot conceive what earthly purpose will be served by bringing Parliament together here, what earthly purpose it will serve to have financial statements submitted or careful estimates prepared, if after these have been submitted, discussed, and voted on in Parliament, we are to find that millions of money may be