

practice, when a parliament dies by efflux of time, or when ministers have lost the confidence of parliament and a dissolution is settled upon, is that full supplies for the next current year are not voted. That is the general rule which my hon. friend, the leader of the House, read yesterday, but there was a notable exception to that in 1868 in England, when the full supplies for the next current year were voted by common consent. The usual English practice is to provide such estimates, by common consent, before the separation of parliament, as will cover the necessary and ordinary expense of the country up to the time parliament usually assembles. That is the English practice and the adoption of that practice in Canada last year would have obviated the necessity for a session at this period of the year. If that request had not been opposed by the Liberal party in the House of Commons last winter we would have had supplies, and this session would have been rendered unnecessary. I say further that the Liberal-Conservative party in 1878, when the case was almost parallel with what it was last session—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, no, you are altogether wrong.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I am not wrong. The parliament was dying by efflux of time, as Mr. Todd puts it in his book. There is a foot note in Todd's work referring to the circumstance of 1878, and on the 6th of May of that year estimates for the year to be entered upon were agreed to by the House of Commons without any difference of opinion on the part of hon. members except as to the amount; and the full supplies for the next current year were voted by parliament, and the Liberal-Conservative party, when placed in the same position as the Liberals were placed last winter in the parliament of Canada, granted full supplies, and the result was it did not necessitate a session of parliament such as the one we are now having, and which will incur on the tax-payers of the country an expenditure of about half a million dollars. Yesterday the hon. leader of the Senate asked my hon. friend the leader of the opposition for the parliamentary references in regard to the voting of temporary supplies during the last session of parliament. Now, I have the *Hansard* in my hand, and if my hon. friend will turn to

volume 2 of the *Hansard* last winter, page 7146, he will find Mr. Foster, speaking of the estimates for the next fiscal year, said :

Mr. FOSTER—In the main estimates there are two items that I would like to have passed. What I want to ask hon. gentlemen opposite is to make it unnecessary that the House should assemble here in July and have a summer session, which is inconvenient and expensive as well. The proposition I would make to them is, if they cannot see their way clear to give us our working estimates for next year, to give us, at least, two or three months' estimates, in order that parliament may find it unnecessary to meet so soon. I think there is nothing unreasonable in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—It is utterly impossible.

I say that in refusing two or three months temporary supply there was a complete departure from the English practice which, as I have already said, and which Todd shows most conclusively, is to grant temporary supplies, or limited supplies such as will be necessary until the usual time for parliament to meet. Parliament sits nearly the whole year round in England, and it is not necessary to vote the same amount of supplies as in Canada, but the proposition made by Mr. Foster if agreed to by the Liberal party of the House of Commons, would have obviated the necessity of this session, and would have saved the tax-payers of the country a large sum of money, and would have saved the members of both Houses the great inconvenience of leaving their business at this season of the year—having been engaged in the elections, almost since the rising of the last parliament—to come here and attend a session at this inconvenient season. For the expenditure incurred in consequence of the failure to vote supplies, for the inconvenience to members and the loss to the country, the opposition in the House of Commons last session must be held justly responsible. But turning just for one moment again to the subject of these Governor General's warrants, it certainly seems to me that if the government must violate the law, and must have recourse to Governor General's warrants, they should have been very careful in their applications for warrants. What do we find? We find by returns submitted to the House of Commons the other day for the month of July that one million and sixty-six thousand dollars odd were asked for. A warrant was obtained for that amount, and up to the time the return was laid on the table of the