

which more certainly comes within the words used or within the intention of parliament, than the case which occurred. Who imagines, that if the Conservative party had succeeded at the elections, they would not have interpreted the statute in the way we interpreted it? Would they have felt at liberty to say "No. expenditure for the officials is not required, and we can get on quite well without it," and would they have refused to pass the order? They would not have thought of such a thing for a moment. It would have been absurd. I say with the utmost confidence, that the expenditure of the money required for the carrying on of the government for the couple of months necessary to be provided for was expenditure urgently and immediately required for the public good. It will be observed that every reasonable precaution is provided by the statute against any misuse of this privilege and this duty—I call it a duty—for I say, not only were we at liberty to act upon this statute for the purpose I have mentioned, but it was our duty to act upon it. We had no alternative. We would be violating the duty which we were sworn to perform, if, with that statute before us, we had left the salaries unpaid and the corresponding duties unperformed. The statute provides every precaution that a statute could provide to prevent a misuse of the privilege that is given. The minister in charge of the service has to report that the necessity is urgent. The Council has to be satisfied that it is urgent and immediately required for the public good, and then the Governor General is at liberty to issue his warrant. I would say further, that under the circumstances, it was his duty to issue his warrant.

It is said that it is the fault of the Liberal party that provision was not made last session for these expenditures. There are several answers to that observation. I might answer it by saying that that was one of the matters discussed in the elections which have just taken place, and the people, by their verdict, have sent a majority of the representatives of the Liberal party to parliament, notwithstanding the charge that was made against them on this account. That of itself is a complete answer. One might say other things. What was desired by the late government was, that the estimates for a whole year should be voted. I do not find

that there was any other message from His Excellency brought down, or any other proposition made, unless it may have been verbally across the House as my hon. friend stated. I have not time to verify that statement further, but it is not suggested that there was any formal proposal for anything short of a year's expenditure. What was the duty of the late government on this subject? It is stated very clearly in one of the passages which I think were cited by the hon. mover of the address, in which he referred to the 520th page of May. It is expressly declared there, that a government ought not to ask for a year's estimates, previous to a dissolution and where the time is such that a year's estimates are not required. Here is the language:

If the dissolution occurs in the early portion of a session, before supply is completed, it may be necessary to take votes on account sufficient to carry on all the services, army and navy as well as civil, until the new parliament is able to consider the grant of supply.

Several illustrations of that are given there.

In 1857 and 1886 supply was taken for four and five months; in 1880 a supply was taken for three months for navy and civil service, and a four months' grant for education—just according to the period, which, in view of the time of the dissolution, was thought proper. In June, 1841, Lord John Russell proposed to take supplies to the end of October. If that conversation took place which my hon. friend referred to, in which the government proposed to abandon the attempt to pass the whole year's estimates, it was only after considerable debate, and after they found they could not carry the estimates as a whole. In that case of 1841 Sir Robert Peel objected that if they took supplies till October, this would enable the government to defer the meeting of parliament till October, and Mr. Gladstone stated that parliament should be summoned as soon as possible. It has always to be considered that for whatever period the government take supplies, even if they were beaten at the polls, they would have the means of retaining office and not calling a session of parliament until the supply would be exhausted. It is manifestly not very material now why the Liberal opposition of last session were unwilling to give the supplies. Rightly or wrongly they were not willing to trust the government of the day. It was quite unde-