

his audience was not sufficiently large for him might simply move an adjournment.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: But this is an exceptional case. My honourable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Bostock) has suggested that we might advantageously occupy the time this afternoon in listening to the senior member for Halifax (Hon. Mr. Power), instead of the honourable gentleman who moved the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: I transfer my right to him.

Hon. Mr. POWER: Honourable gentlemen, I am much obliged to the honourable members of the House for the courtesy they have extended to me. I have not very much to say.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Will the honourable gentleman permit me to interrupt for one moment? There is a point of order which is rather important. I think my honourable friend from Halifax (Hon. Mr. Crosby) has lost his right to speak, under the rules. I do not want to raise the point when he stands up to speak at the next meeting of the House, but unless this question is settled now, I shall raise the point when the House does meet again. He has lost his turn.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: As I understand it, the honourable gentleman from Halifax on this side (Hon. Mr. Crosby), by leave of the House, asks that the senior member for Halifax (Hon. Mr. Power) be permitted to precede him in the discussion. That is all he asks, and it is done by leave of the House, the honourable gentleman reserving to himself the right to address the House when we resume.

Hon. Mr. POWER: I should be very sorry to do anything that would deprive the House of the pleasure of hearing my honourable colleague from Halifax on a future day; and, as I have mentioned, I have not very much to say. I have come to that time of life and membership when one does not care to be obliged to hold back anything in the nature of a speech to be made by himself.

I notice that the honourable gentleman from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) devoted a reasonable length of time to a criticism of the Government for not providing for a dissolution. I feel this way about that matter, honourable gentlemen. The present Administration—or, at any rate, the Administration of which the

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT.

present is the successor—passed an act known as the War-time Elections Act. That Act, I do not hesitate to say, is probably the most unfair and objectionable Act with respect to voting that has ever been passed in any English-speaking community. I do not feel as my honourable friend from De Lorimier does; I do not think that there is any occasion for our worrying over dissolution. The honourable gentleman from De Lorimier knows very well—better than I do—the character of the measures by which the Government secured a continuance in office after 1917; and it is perfectly safe to say that a government or party who could make use of such an instrument as the War-time Elections Act to secure office are not going to retire from office until they are obliged to do so. This position reminds me somewhat of a remark made a great many years ago, during the McKenzie administration, by Mr. Joseph Rymal, who was a member from an Ontario constituency. He said: "The she-bear robbed of her cubs is mild compared with the Liberal Conservative out of office." And the Liberal Conservative, like the leopard, has not changed his spots since.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: The other fellows have changed several times.

Hon. Mr. POWER: I do not think, honourable gentlemen, that on an occasion of this sort, when we are dealing with the Speech from the Throne, the members are bound strictly to the limits set forth in the Speech. The practice has been, I think, always to regard the House on this occasion as a sort of committee on the state of the Dominion, every member having the right to express his views not only on the coming measures indicated in the Speech from the Throne, but also on the record of the Government during their past administration. I think that on the present occasion it is more than usually justifiable and desirable that this practice should be followed. This is an occasion when, as I have said, we should not be confined within strict limits; and this is the more true because the actions of the present Government, as anyone who examines into their record will see, do not by any means always square with their declarations of intention. Up to 1873 or 1874 there was a theory that none but a Conservative Government could administer the affairs of Canada in a satisfactory way. I do not know now