

I also quote from the second volume, at page 504 :

It is customary when parliament is about to be dissolved, whether upon the occurrence of a ministerial crisis or for any other reason, to restrict the grant of supplies to an amount sufficient to defray the indispensable requirements of the public service until the new parliament can be assembled.

And Mr. Todd cites there a debate in the English House of Commons in the session of 1868, where the question was discussed and the principle recognized, that the proper course is to vote only sufficient supplies to carry the country over the general election. The same doctrine will be found at page 520 of the Tenth Edition of May's Parliamentary Practice. Now, hon. gentlemen, I think that in the present case it was the more important that parliament should not vote the supplies for the whole year, and that the new parliament should be summoned to deal with the estimates, because the government which appealed to the country on the 23rd June last, was not the government which had appealed to the electors for their support and had received that support in 1891. It might be contended that the government led by Sir John Abbott and the government led by Sir John Thompson and the government led by the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition in this House, if not the identical government in which the electors had reposed their confidence in 1891, was at least the legitimate and regular successor of that government ; but a crisis took place in the course of last session, as hon. gentlemen well remember, and a new government was constituted just after the close of the session, and that new government was in no sense identical with the ministry which had governed this country for so many years. On the contrary, we found that at least three members of that government who had been the most faithful followers of the previous First Minister, the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House, were excluded from the new government. It was a new government and a new policy. The leader was old, but he was, in another sense new, and consequently there was the more reason why this government, which had never had the confidence of the country, should not be allowed to dispose of the vast sums of money which are dealt with by the annual estimates of Canada. I think, hon.

gentlemen, there are perfectly good and valid reasons why we are called together here now. There is another matter which naturally suggests itself in dealing with this particular paragraph of the speech. The new government coming in, found that they could not, with any regard to the convenience of parliament or the country, pass the estimates immediately, and then there were large numbers of public servants whose wages and salaries had to be paid ; and it may be truly said that the business of many places, and more particularly the business of the city of Ottawa, depended very largely upon the prompt and regular payment of wages and salaries to the government employés. What course was the government to take? Was the government to allow these employés to remain unpaid, or was it to take some steps to pay them? I think the government took a perfectly proper course. They obtained from the Governor General his warrant to pay the regular employés of the government at Ottawa and throughout the country. I think their conduct was perfectly proper and warranted. On this point of the Governor General's warrant, I do not wish to detain the House, but I propose to refer to the law on the subject, which is to be found in the Revised Statutes of Canada, chap. 29, sec. 32. I just quote from Bourinot at page 579 :

Special warrants may issue, when parliament is not in session and any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good ; and a statement of all such warrants is laid before the House not later than the third day of the next session.

Now, hon. gentlemen, these expenditures were not provided for by parliament and they were urgently and immediately required for the public good.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—
What is the statute?

Hon. Mr. POWER—It is chapter 29 of the Revised Statute, section 32. The object of that section was to enable the government to make provision for unexpected cases. The statute says that "if a public work is in absolute need of repair, &c." These Governor General's warrants have been used in the past for all sorts of purposes. They have been used by the Conservative party for the purpose of paying for new works, of doing things which have not