

concerned, but it is as near as my hon. friend gets to it generally. The only reason that the leader of the Government has given why there are no viands upon the table is that all he wants is supply. He puts this declaration in the mouth of the Governor General :

The necessity of making provision for the public service has compelled me to summon you together at this somewhat inconvenient season. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was perfectly at liberty not to ask for anything but supply, and to say so in the Speech he put into the mouth of the Governor General ; but I submit that when my hon. friend proposed to state that, he should at least have given the real reason, and not put a wrong reason in the mouth of the Governor General. Why, Sir, if it had been a truthful expression it would have read. I think, something like this : " The stupid and unreasonable obstruction pursued by the Liberal party at the late session of Parliament having resulted in a refusal of all supplies for the fiscal year 1896-97 at a time when they might have been voted with comfort to the House and economy to the country, has compelled me to call you together at this inconvenient season and at great public expense." That would have been a truthful reason to have given, and to have put in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General. The supply that is being asked for is the supply for the fiscal year 1896-97. The time to make that supply was in the session of 1895-96. That time came about last year. There was ample time in which to make the supply ; there was information ready for every item that was asked. There was a pressing necessity for every session must make and ought to make, unless very grave reasons intervene—a sufficient and ample supply for the services of the succeeding year. There was the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General. Why, then, was the supply not granted ? No extraordinary supply was asked for. It was only the simple, ordinary supply for the regular and ordinary services of the country. A supply was asked for one year. When the gentlemen in opposition opposed the granting of a full supply, the proposition was made that supply for six months should be given. That would have avoided altogether the necessity of an extra session, and would have allowed the House to convene at about its usual time without the great inconvenience and the great expense attendant upon this session. When that was refused, the proposition was made to the hon. gentleman to give a three months supply, which would tide over the season of the hot weather, and allow Parliament to meet late in the autumn, when one session would have done for the services of the two years, instead of two sessions, which are now necessary. Why was this not done ? Simply because the hon. gentlemen then in opposition to the Government thought fit to obstruct and pre-

Mr. FOSTER.

vent a supply. They gave as a reason that the Remedial Bill intervened ; but, Sir, if you search the records you will find that ample time was spent in the obstruction to going into supply to grant the ordinary supply for three months, for six months, for a year, and therefore no necessity whatever existed for the calling of this session. Why it is called to-day and why supplies must be voted is due entirely to the unreasonable obstruction of hon. gentlemen opposite who were then in opposition. But even supposing they were unreasonable and obstructed supply then, was there any reason really for calling us together now to get supplies ? None ; not the least. The hon. gentlemen entered upon a course of policy boldly and recklessly. Why did they not pursue it ? If they had been as brave as they were reckless to pursue it, they need not have called Parliament together until January, they need not have called Parliament together until next July, they need not have called it together at all. These hon. gentlemen, after having been asked to vote a foreseen and regular expenditure, and after they had deliberately refused, when they fell into the pit that they had dug for others, had recourse to the authorization of Governor General's warrants, and have been appropriating moneys for the public service of this country without the sanction of law and without the sanction of Parliament. What do I find ? I find that in the month of July a Governor General's warrant was asked for, and given without hesitation, for one million dollars. For what ? To meet an unforeseen expenditure ? Was it because some cataclysm had destroyed the public works of the country and made it necessary to implement them at once before Parliament could be called ? No, Sir, but to pay the salaries and wages and working expenses of the departments of the Government—to meet foreseen expenses, stated expenses, which they themselves refused to vote. These careful, prudent, law-abiding men, did more than that. They took the Governor General's warrant freely given for one million dollars. They could spend but \$600,000 of it. These are the close financiers, these are the admirable estimators of what they require. Somebody acting as Minister of Finance, on his word as Minister of Finance, and buoyed up by his coadjutors, made a solemn declaration to the Governor General that the Government were in absolute necessity for a million dollars in order to meet the departmental expenses for the month of July. They got the million dollars and spent \$600,000 of it, and had to put back \$400,000 perforce at the end of July into the public treasury because they did not need it. These gentlemen, not satisfied with that experience, got another Governor General's warrant in the month of August, one day before Parliament met, as freely granted, for another million dollars to meet de-