

itemized statement, that would have ended it, because he could not have given it, but the hon. gentleman led us to believe that he had these different items particularized, and if he had given the statement then that would have been an end to any discussion as far as the \$37,500 item is concerned. As far as these estimates are concerned, I think we made very good headway until we struck this item of \$37,500. When we had passed a million and some odd dollars I think it was time to adjourn. The hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Customs were both active members of the opposition, and I think I am not saying too much when I say that when it came to an unreasonable hour and they asked for an adjournment and our friends did not grant an adjournment there was only one method left for them to pursue, and that was to act stubbornly and say: We will not allow any items to pass. Knowing this, these hon. gentlemen ought to have some respect for the opposition now. If we had adjourned at 10.30 or 11 o'clock, I think we would have accomplished just as much as we are doing now.

Mr. SPROULE. I submit to the hon. Postmaster General that the information given us is not the information we are accustomed to have in this House. He will remember that when Sir Mackenzie Bowell occupied the position of Minister of Customs he came down to this House with a book containing all the details, and as soon as an item was called he read from his book the explanation of how much he wanted for this and how much for that. We have passed the item providing for the ordinary expenditure on civil government salaries. What does it say in the Auditor General's Report? I asked the hon. Minister of Customs how much he wanted for salaries in the different provinces. He could give no information whatever. The Auditor General's Report shows that for salaries and contingencies there was an expenditure in Ontario of \$324,329. Surely the hon. gentleman had that information. Then I find that there was an expenditure of \$261,905 for Quebec, and there is a separate item for each of the other provinces. Yet the hon. minister could give us no information about this item of \$1,184,865 under this head. Is it fair to ask an opposition, which is doing its proper duty, to allow items of this kind and size to pass on such meagre information? It is not an answer to say you have it in the Auditor General's Report. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) gave an illustration of the absurdity of presenting this as an argument and of saying we should be satisfied with that. There was no more unreasonable man in this House than the hon. Postmaster General when he and his friends were in opposition. There was no more unreasonable man in this House than he was. We are doing our duty as we conceive it, and we shall exercise our own judg-

ment as to what we conceive to be our duty. The hon. Minister of Customs stands up without any information and says: I want \$1,184,865 for salaries and contingencies, and you can find the explanation of it in the Auditor General's Report. I say that we will not be doing our duty by allowing these items to pass. No opposition can faithfully discharge its duty without more information as to what the money is required for than that which the hon. Minister of Customs has given to-night. We are amply justified in the demand that we shall get the information which has been so unreasonably denied us.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I pledge my word that never since the hon. gentleman was in this House was the information he asked for denied or asked for. I say that never since this House has sat, and never since Canada had a parliament, were such details demanded or furnished to parliament. My hon. friend says that I myself made these demands, and that I was very unreasonable in having done so. Then, why follow such an unreasonable precedent?

Mr. TAYLOR. We have not begun to follow it yet. The hon. Postmaster General lectured me a few moments ago, saying that he had been so long in public life and that he never saw such tactics pursued as those which he witnessed to-night. I have been in this House as long as the hon. gentleman, and I would remind him that the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Customs and their friends kept us here from Wednesday until Saturday night at twelve o'clock. I never left the House till Saturday night at twelve o'clock, because these hon. gentlemen talked and talked from Wednesday until Saturday. A strong appeal was made by my hon. friends from Grey and Elgin to adjourn at 1 o'clock this morning, after we had voted nearly \$2,000,000, but it was refused. We have been trying ever since to get information. As the minister in charge is not present, I will wait until he returns.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman can not detain the House unless he is addressing it.

Mr. INGRAM. In order to save time, I will point out that in the 'Hansard' for 1895, Mr. Mulock now Sir William Mulock, and then in opposition, strongly insisted on getting information about certain items, and the report in the 'Hansard' shows that Mr. Foster then Minister of Finance gave full explanations to Mr. Mulock. We, the members of the opposition, are constantly met in our campaigns with statements by supporters of the government, that these items are passed year after year without criticism, and they even go so far as to say that we do not record a single vote against them. When reasonable questions are asked by gentlemen of the opposition, the least the