

House, only a little over \$600,000 was used or accounted for. It is explained that a portion of the money is for letters of credit which have not yet been returned, and which will account for a portion of the money, but it is certain that a large sum was asked for, and that the sum is largely in excess of the expenditure for the month of July. Then, on the 18th day of the present month, only one day before the assembling of this parliament, they applied for and obtained another Governor General's warrant for another million dollars, which is also in excess of the requirements of the month of August. Here we have, one day before parliament meets, the control of this one million dollars taken out of the hands of the representatives of the people and taken hold of by the executive of the country. Remembering, as we very well do, when our friends were in opposition the strong objection they raised to the government of the day using this power, it is very remarkable that no sooner are they placed on the treasury benches and entrusted with power than they use it, and, I think, contrary to law, and use it in excess of their immediate requirements; and as the House was so soon to be in session, if they were short of any amount it could easily be obtained from parliament within a very short time after the opening of the session. In looking over the speech with which we were favoured at the opening of the session the other day, it has been the subject of general remark that it absolutely contains nothing. We have been called for the purpose of voting supplies and nothing else. It seems to me that the honourable Minister of Justice proves too much. If it was so eminently proper on the part of the government to issue Governor General's warrants for a round million dollars in the month of July and another million dollars the day before parliament met in the month of August, it would be just as proper for them to have gone on for two or three months longer and obtained all the money they wanted for carrying on the business of the country in the same way. Certainly, I think if they can satisfy the country that they have acted constitutionally and legally in issuing these warrants in July and August, they would have been able to satisfy the country had they made similar provision for two or three months following. In view of the half a million that would have been saved to the country, they would have been justified in going a little

further and obtaining a few millions more to avoid the necessity of this extra session. That is if the Minister of Justice is right in his view of the law. But we are told there is to be no measure of importance, beyond the voting of these supplies, submitted to parliament on the present occasion. The operation of the tariff is going to be made the subject of careful inquiry during the recess, with a view to the preparation of such a measure as may, without doing injustice to any interest, materially lighten the burdens of the people. Now, in connection with that, I would refer hon. gentlemen to a speech made by the Hon. Mr. Laurier, the Premier, at St. Johns, Que., in July. He says:

Nothing will be done in this direction during the coming session which will be exclusively devoted to the voting of supplies. The following session will probably take place in January, 1897, and ere then, the Hon. Mr. Fielding will have put himself into communication with the managers of the country and in fact with all sections of the people and will bring down a tariff that will, besides giving sufficient protection to the industries of Canada, lighten the burden of taxation which weighs too heavily upon the masses.

Now, I submit that this declaration is not at all consistent with the expressions of the Liberal party up to the date on which the elections were last held. They have been varying their policy during the last eighteen years that they have been in opposition: one day it is a revenue tariff, another it is free trade as it is in England, then it is commercial union and then unrestricted reciprocity, and then they come back to free trade and to a revenue tariff; but I have understood from the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House in the interest of the government, that their policy is to be a revenue tariff. I submit that this declaration of the Premier, and the speech we have had from the Throne, do not at all indicate the passage of a revenue tariff. If a revenue tariff is to be the policy of the government, it seems to me it is not at all necessary to consult the manufacturers or any other section of the people with regard to it. If revenue requirements alone are to be taken into consideration, it is not necessary to go round the country consulting these people, and this occupation and this industry and that industry. All that has to be done is to hew close to the line of revenue requirements, let the chips fall where they may, but as