

that the Government had promised Mr. Arch to give every immigrant on arrival a homestead.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said that Mr. Arch had the impression that homesteads would be given to immigrants in the way mentioned, but before he left for England the Government disabused his mind of the idea. A few cottages had, however, been erected. He thought it inexpedient to extend the fund for homesteads. It cost \$200 to build a cottage and clear five acres of land for each individual.

Mr. RYKERT thought that no better inducement to immigration could be afforded than the homestead system. He was certain, however, from the utterances of Mr. Arch in England that he still believed that these homesteads would be granted. He read extracts from the speeches of Mr. Arch in England, in which it was stated that the Government had pledged itself to look after and take care of immigrants from his Union, and at Leamington Mr. Arch told the English people that the Government were prepared to build a comfortable log hut for each immigrant and his family, would clear five acres of land, and would find the seed necessary to plant it. He (Mr. Rykert) called the attention of the Government to this declaration of Mr. Arch, which had been circulated all over England, because the Commissioner now said that this policy was to be abandoned, and only twenty-four cottages built. He asked whether twenty-four cottages would be sufficient for all the English immigrants who might place faith in the promises of Mr. Arch. One English immigrant deceived would do more harm to this country, than could be remedied by the exertions of a Mr. Arch for twenty-five years. If the Government had altered their policy, the people should be informed of such change. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ARDAGH said the way immigrants were received on their arrival was calculated to create in their minds a very unfavourable impression of the country. He had often advised immigrants not to go by the immigrants' train, but to pay the additional sum in order to travel by the ordinary trains. He had received complaints from persons following the latter course that they had not been allowed to avail themselves of the advantage secured by this additional payment, but had been forced to travel by the immigrants' train.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said that the Government had taken every pains to prevent the claims of this country being exaggerated when immigration was invited. The advantages offered to the agricultural labourer by this country were so important that there was no necessity for exaggeration. It was impossible to prevent immigrants from forming too sanguine views of a new country. With regard to Mr. Arch's speech at Leamington, he was not acquainted with it, but the Government had distinctly told him that it was only possible to build a limited number of these cottages, and he thought that comparatively few would come to this country with the expectation of settling in this way. He was extremely sorry if the claims of this country had been exaggerated.

The item then passed.

The item of \$2,000 for Trent River Bridge was then passed, and the Committee rose and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT moved the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 1.30 p. m.

Evening Session.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3.20 p. m.

ABSENT MEMBERS.

Mr. CRAIG (Glengarry) moved that the absence from this House this session of William Craig, Esq., member for the County of Russell, and Thomas McC. Fairbairn, Esq., member for the West Riding of the County of Peterboro' having been caused by severe illness, this House unanimously authorises the accountant to remit to them the sessional allowance to which, but for their absence, they would have been entitled, but that this resolution shall not be taken as a precedent to authorise such payments in future. Carried.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MERRICK said that in the debate last night the Premier had declared that it was a sound constitutional rule for the Government to divert public money from the use to which this House appropriated it. He thought the House ought either to affirm this principle or to disavow it. There

was no right which the House ought to guard more carefully than this, no action of the Government which ought to be protested against more strongly than the diversion of money voted by the House for a particular purpose to any different purpose. He could readily understand the principles which had actuated the Attorney-General to pursue the course he had taken on this question. They had had an illustration of his views in reference to the rights of Parliament in the manner in which he had treated certain bills passed by the House last session, but by his advice not assented to. Last year the House voted a certain sum of money for the erection of a lock-up at Bruce Mines. The Government, however, saw fit to revoke that decision and expend the money 300 or 400 miles away from Bruce Mines, for a similar purpose, it was true, but without the sanction of the Legislature. The Attorney-General had said it was necessary to expend the money at Silver Islet, and had contended that the amount, if not charged under this head, might be charged under the head of Unforeseen and Unprovided. Unfortunately for the Government, however, the amount voted for the unforeseen and unprovided expenses had been almost entirely expended. The Government had spent last year about \$49,500 of the \$50,000 voted for that purpose, and the balance would not have been sufficient for the purpose. The Public Accounts ought to be entirely correct in the whole and in detail, or hon. members would be unable intelligently to express their opinion on public expenditure. This money was spent at Silver Islet, and yet the Government stated in the Public Accounts that it was expended at Bruce Mines, which was not correct in point of fact. It had been asserted that one of the principles of the Reform Party was that money appropriated by a vote of Parliament should not be diverted. That was at all events the principle of the Opposition. He therefore moved in amendment that all the words after "that" in the original motion be struck out, and the following substituted: "In the opinion of this House no public money appropriated by Parliament for a particular work in a certain locality should be diverted by an Order in Council at the mere will of the Executive, thereby ignoring the express will of Parliament, such diversion being a violation of a well understood principle of constitutional practice, and fraught with danger to the liberties of the people and the privileges of Parliament."

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said it was impossible for the Government to accept this motion, inasmuch as any amendment to a motion to go into committee of supply was necessarily a motion of no confidence. In the case of an invasion of the country, the Government would be bound to use every dollar in the Treasury for the purpose of resisting such invasion. An emergency of this kind would override any appropriation of this Legislature. While the rule laid down in the resolution was nearly of universal application in regard to the money voted by this House, there were still occasional exceptions. The Government were also bound to attend to the administration of justice, the enforcement of the laws, and the maintenance of peace and order in every part of the country, and if there was any money in the Treasury which the House had appropriated to other objects, then it was the duty of the Government to use that money towards securing these ends. Except in these instances, he believed, and quite as strongly as hon. gentlemen opposite professed to believe, that money voted should be applied to the purpose for which the Legislature had appropriated it. He would form no part of a Government who were not prepared to carry out that principle wherever practicable. In this case, however, there was no margin in the unforeseen and unprovided fund. The Government discovered, after the money had been voted, that it was not required for the Bruce mines, that the mining population had gone to Silver Islet, and from frequent representations of the officials of that district the Government found it was absolutely necessary for the protection of the people there that a lock-up should be provided. He had no hesitation in saying that upon all principles which statesmen recognize, that it was the duty of the Government, under these circumstances, to apply the money, although not voted for the purpose, to establish the lock-up. That being the case, the resolution was without meaning, and was utterly preposterous and absurd unless it condemned the conduct of the Government in establishing this lock-up at Silver Islet. He knew hon. gentlemen would deny the truth of an argument, no matter how clearly stated, if