

and deal with it as briefly as practicable. The first paragraph of the Speech says :

The necessity of making provision for the public service has compelled me to summon you together at this somewhat inconvenient season.

I may say that while the season is not the most convenient, it is a more convenient season than the one indicated by the original proclamation which summoned Parliament to meet on the 16th July. We should have suffered a good deal more from heat and other discomforts if we had met at that time than we are likely to suffer now. The weather is getting cool, and Ottawa is a much pleasanter place to live in, and the temperature in the building is much more agreeable to work in. This paragraph tells us that we are summoned on account of the necessity of making provision for the public service. The question naturally suggests itself "why was not provision made for the public service before?"

Hon. GENTLEMEN—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I thought I should find a number of hon. gentlemen prepared to ask that question and to sympathize with me. Well, hon. gentlemen, the reasons are plain enough to be seen. In the first place, during last session the time of parliament which would under ordinary circumstances have been occupied in dealing with the estimates and making provision for the public service, was devoted to the consideration of the Remedial Bill. The late government introduced that measure, and the discussion upon it continued up to about, I think, a week before the death of the last parliament, and consequently there was no time to consider the estimates. That is one reason. Another reason why there has been no opportunity to consider the estimates before the 1st July, is that the late government, when they dissolved parliament, postponed the elections to a late date. The government might have had the elections earlier, and parliament might have been summoned for some time in the month of June, so that the estimates for the present year might have been considered and disposed of. That is an additional reason why we are called here now; and, as hon. gentlemen know, as a matter of fact, the late government resigned office at such a date that it was practically impossible that parliament

should meet and deal with the estimates. The late government resigned somewhere about the 8th or 9th July, and if Parliament had met, as the original proclamation provided, on the 16th July, it would have been necessary that parliament should adjourn in order to enable the new ministers to go to their elections, and we should not have got back here very much earlier than we have actually come. So that the reasons, whether they are satisfactory or not, are substantial reasons why parliament has not up to the present time made provision for the public service. Then, hon. gentlemen, I dare say there are some of you who think that there is another reason, and I know it has been stated in the press and by the speakers of the Conservative party, that there was something quite abandoned and unparliamentary and reckless in the conduct of the Liberal members in parliament, because they did not vote the estimates *en bloc* at the close of last session. It is worth while, on a question of such importance, citing two or three authorities upon that point. The true constitutional parliamentary doctrine is that when a dissolution is about taking place, Parliament does not vote supplies for the whole year. The practice in England, and the true constitutional practice, is that parliament shall vote supplies sufficient to carry the country over the time of the general elections and not supplies for the whole year. On that point I may refer to one or two authorities. If hon. gentlemen will refer to Todd's Parliamentary Government in the Colonies, page 788, they will find the doctrine laid down there. I do not quote from that, but I quote from the first volume of his Parliamentary Government in England, because Todd lays down the same doctrine in the two works. I quote from page 758 of the first volume of Todd's Parliamentary Government in England :

When parliament is about to be dissolved upon a ministerial crisis, it is obviously improper to call upon the House of Commons to vote either the full amount or all the details of the proposed estimates and so commit the country to the financial policy of ministers whose fate is about to be determined by a general election. The duty of finally deciding on these estimates should be reserved for the new House of Commons. Meanwhile, the supply of credit should be restricted to such an amount as may be absolutely required for the public service until the reassembling of parliament, and the vote on account should not be regarded as in any degree pledging the House to an approval of the entire estimates.