

partmental expenses. Well, I put this logically to sensible men. If you can by Governor General's warrant appropriate two million dollars for departmental salaries, why can you not appropriate twelve million dollars for the same purpose? What is the use of calling Parliament together in August to go through the form of appropriation? If you can appropriate two million dollars for departmental expenses, salaries of employees, expenditure as stated regular and foreseen as anything can be, why can you not appropriate a million dollars for public works? Why can you not appropriate half a million dollars for marine? Why can you not go through the whole list and make the whole \$36,000,000 appropriation, and not go through the farce of calling Parliament together at all? But how the welkin would have resounded with the denunciations of this bold outrage, this unprincipled invasion of the constitution, this destruction of the very foundation of parliamentary government, if we had been elected to power and had done this. Maybe we would not have got a Governor General's warrant. But if we had, all the Grit newspapers of the country would to this day have been ringing the changes on this unparalleled conduct of an unprincipled Tory Government. Talk about wobblers. I see before me the boss wobbler of them all. In 1891, my genial and moderate friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who sits in front of me, had the honour of fulminating on this side of the House against the iniquity of Governor General's warrants. He brought up his motion, he attested to it by his speech, he was joined by his brother Liberals, and smoke and fire were visible in this Parliament for the two or three hours that the fulmination was going on. But the Governor General's warrant which was given then was but an infant in swaddling clothes compared with these giants of July and August. The Governor General's warrant then was a mild-mannered one for an expenditure which had not been foreseen, and which had not been foreseen through the fault probably of a superior officer, but not of the Minister or the Government. But the fact remained that it had not been foreseen. It was for Intercolonial Railway purposes, and the chief officer justified neglect by declaring that owing to the time the accounts came in, he did not know it would be wanted, and consequently the supply was not asked.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from Queen's is given to being very sceptical. He puts on, not the regulation look of affliction, which one of the voters of Queen's-Sunbury said the Liberals will have to put on after five o'clock to-night, but he puts on an air of infinite contempt and scepticism with regard to any statement that may be made

by an opponent. I know what I state, and I am willing, when the proper time comes, to argue that question from the facts of the case. I say that never was a Governor General's warrant asked for by a Liberal-Conservative Government of the nature of these last two warrants. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) laid down the law, after he had read the Act. He said you can give a Governor General's warrant when some public work is damaged or destroyed by some event which could not have been foreseen and for which there is therefore no appropriation, and when it is requisite in the public interest that it should be rebuilt or repaired without delay. You can, he said, on occasions of great emergency, not foreseen or provided for, have recourse to Governor General's warrants; but for what was foreseen and recommended and asked for and then refused by Parliament, the fiat of Parliament is against you, and a Governor General's warrant ought not to be used and cannot be used, under the law and the constitution, which govern responsible and parliamentary government. But our hon. friends easily forget in power the statements and the positions they took when out of power. I believe the Toronto "Globe" unfortunately had a homily, not long after the elections, on the difficulty which a party experiences when it comes into power, in keeping up to their promises and professions out of office. My hon. friend from South Oxford has unfortunately read that insinuating editorial and fallen from grace. I desire to say this, that if these hon. gentlemen who represent Liberalism, who are introducing a new era, who have commenced to supplant the functions and duties of Parliament, by Governor General's warrant, were as brave as they are bold and reckless, they would have kept on appropriating for six months and not have called us together at all. I like a brave man. Boldness, if it is to be successful with the people, must be accompanied with bravery. Once having commenced to assume the rights of Parliament and appropriate by Governor General's warrants, why did these gentlemen not stick to it, and why did they call us together to go through a mere form?

But, leaving that point for the moment—these gentlemen are going to ask us to vote supply. I notice that my hon. friend the leader of the Government has published far and wide his intention of introducing a new policy for the North-west. His principal newspapers have followed up his indication, and to-day the press and public mind is full of the new policy, the new departure, which, by the way, all say may cost a large amount of money, but if it opens up the North-west it is well worth the money they say, and it must be pursued. They will place their Estimates on the Table and ask us to vote them. Will they ask for supply