

Thomas White failed, our new friend—who, I am told, is an excellent lawyer, and has other excellent qualities but no special knowledge of finance—will succeed? Is the miracle of the loaves and fishes to be repeated, and is the present Minister of Finance going to succeed where the other failed? My own suggestion, Mr. Speaker, would be not to wait too long for the development of this new captain of finance, but to make a change entirely, lock, stock and barrel, and let the people have an opportunity of putting new men at the wheel.

Our good friend the Prime Minister seems to think it a cure-all to prevent anything being done in this House which would in the slightest way savour of a change of Government. He must understand that there are some timid hearts sitting behind him, because whenever there is a cloud on the horizon he tells them there may be a change of Government, and that is an end of any difficulty from that quarter. We are, however, in the hands of the people. This Government has been returned by the people in a sort of a way; it is something like tying a man's feet and tying his hands and gagging him, and then asking him to express his opinion. That is the sort of an electorate that put our hon. friends on the treasury benches. The sooner the fetters are taken off the legs and the hands and the gag is removed, and the people of Canada are allowed to pronounce a free and open judgment on the affairs of this country, the better it will be for Canada and its affairs.

I was referring to the different members who left us. For many years I sat with the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). I admired him then; I admire him now. True, I would not run after him to-day as vigorously as I would have done some years ago, but no person need for a moment question the ability of the ex-Minister of Public Works. He also was finding that the place was getting a little hot and uncomfortable, and his position reminds me of a story which you, Mr. Speaker, have often heard about the fox who was running around the country for days trying to get a drink. At last he came to a well at the bottom of which he saw a little water, and he was so thirsty that he jumped down. But after slaking his thirst he found he could not get out, and seeing an innocent-looking goat also looking down, he began to tell the goat what a magnificent place that was and how good the water was, and he asked the goat to come down. So the goat jumped into the well, and immediately the fox jumped on

top of the goat and got out. But the goat could not get out. I think that in a similar way the ex-Minister of Public Works was telling Sir Henry Drayton what a magnificent thing it was to be a minister. So the goat got in and the minister got out. That seems to be the position, and if we hear the truth, I think, speaking with all respect and deference, the goat is rather disappointed that he ever listened to the solicitations of the fox.

There are a few other changes. I am very glad that we have a new Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie). While I have no knowledge of the hon. gentleman's ability except what I learn from the press and from a very slight acquaintance with the hon. gentleman himself, I have no doubt that he will give a splendid account of his stewardship. His knowledge of matters of this kind will come to his aid, and, if he is given permission or opportunity to apply his practical knowledge to the department, I have no doubt that he will make good, as the saying is, if this slow drag of a Government will not throw their shackles on him and keep him down to their own pace.

There is one more noted vacancy in this House. I have reference to the ex-hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I am sure that I speak earnestly and sincerely when I say that I regard his going out of this House as a great loss to the debating power, the thinking power, and the legal power that are to be found in this House. Why did he go? That is the question. Was he satisfied with the progress of this Administration? Was he satisfied with the way things were being done? Well, the conclusion which I have reached is that he was not satisfied; that, so far as he was concerned, things were going too slow and this Government was not up to date, and he thought he would register his protest by going out and giving the people of Kingston an opportunity of passing judgment upon this Government.

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the hon. member come to that conclusion from any remarks made by the former member for Kingston?

Mr. McKENZIE: I may say to my hon. friend that I have not seen in print one word one way or the other uttered by the former hon. member for Kingston. I think he has maintained a most discreet silence since leaving the House. I commend him for that, because there is one thing—

Mr. EDWARDS: Did he not state a reason or reasons?