

ing Parliament together until it was dissolved by the flux of time, their duty was plain and clear, their bounded duty was to have dissolved the late Parliament in good time. Their duty was to have dissolved Parliament at such date that the elections could have been held in time to enable the new Parliament to have voted the supplies for the fiscal year. They refused to do that, for reasons best known to themselves, and which I need not discuss now. They compelled us to invoke the only means known to the constitution, in order to prevent grave injury being done to great public interests from one end of the Dominion to the other. I challenge the hon. leader of the Opposition, I challenge his lieutenants to show that we have expended under the Governor General's warrant, one cent or one penny more than we were compelled to expend for the purposes of the public service. Nor have we spent one cent or one penny more than those hon. gentlemen themselves declared to Parliament was necessary for the public service. We have acted absolutely and entirely within the estimates for which those hon. gentlemen were responsible, which they laid on the Table of Parliament, which they introduced here by a Message from His Excellency, signed by himself. It does not lie in their mouths, who created this necessity, to censure us because, under the necessity that had been created, we acted entirely within the lines they laid down. We took upon ourselves, with a due sense of the responsibility, and after having obtained the best legal advice within our reach, to act on what we conceived to be the true intent and spirit of the Audit Act with regard to just such cases, and just such expenditures as have now been laid before you. More, Sir, the country was well aware of what we were doing. The country knew perfectly well—and it was no fault of the hon. gentleman if it did not—what we had done in refusing to assist in passing the Estimates which these hon. gentlemen had brought down. The country emphatically endorsed our action. The people endorsed it before and have endorsed it since. The country understood just as well as we did, the country's instincts were, as they generally are, perfectly right, and it understood the great peril which would have ensued had we placed in the hands of men who had forfeited the confidence of the people, the power of sitting here for a year, which they would have possessed, had we voted these Estimates as they requested.

Now I come to another interesting question. I come to the charge solemnly preferred by these consistent gentlemen, solemnly preferred by the leader of the Opposition, solemnly preferred by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) against my hon. friend—the charge that he has shuffled in his policy with respect to Manitoba. On what is that charge based? Why, it is based on this, that my hon. friend has not

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

seen fit, up to the present time, to issue a commission for the purpose of investigating the state of things in Manitoba. Now, let me ask, under what conditions did my hon. friend propose to issue this commission? For what end, and for what purpose was it to be issued? Again and again, it is in the recollection of this honourable House, and at any rate of those members who sat here before, my hon. friend declared that his policy was conciliation and negotiation. Only in the event of conciliation and negotiation failing would it be necessary to issue a commission for the purpose of ascertaining on what terms the two communities could agree. But, I repeat, that if there was one charge more than another which my hon. friend brought against the late Government, and rightly and properly brought against them, it was the charge that they had acted discourteously and arbitrarily towards Manitoba, that they had not attempted to consult the Manitoba government, that they had rushed to the extreme remedy which the law gave, without the common courtesy of hearing what the government of Manitoba might have to adduce. Have they forgotten that my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy), who acted as the counsel for Manitoba, pleaded before them in vain for a delay of a week or ten days in order to enable the members of the Manitoba government to come down and be heard in person? Have they forgotten the indecent haste with which they rushed into that controversy, and have they forgotten that it was on those grounds, as much as on any other, that my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) condemned their action? But what was those gentlemen's policy? Ours, they say, was a Janus, a double-faced policy, but what of the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition? What of the policy of his trusted friend and whip (Mr. Taylor), whom I now have the pleasure of seeing in his place. My hon. friend beside me last night—the hon. member for Leeds not being present at that time—took occasion to quote from the late ministerial papers, the organs of those hon. gentlemen, a certain remarkable statement made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), to whom I now give the opportunity, if he pleases, of withdrawing or modifying it, if he has anything to say. The statement which my hon. friend then made was that the hon. member for Leeds declared to the electors of North Grey that he had been sent up there to announce that remedial legislation was no more a part of the Conservative policy or platform. He announced further that he had been sent up there to announce that if they voted for Mr. Pater-son, they voted for Quebec domination. Now, I would like to know if those newspaper reports fairly and correctly represent the declaration made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would just like to ask the hon. gentleman from what paper he