

arrange the seating so that the members of whom I speak may not be entirely excluded from participating in the proceedings of this House.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion so far in this debate on the Address. As is usual on an occasion like this, almost every subject worthy of discussion has been touched upon, and, I think, despite criticism, that is as it should be, because there is no other time so suitable for discussing a variety of subjects as the early days of a session, when members have an opportunity of offering suggestions to the Government and to this Parliament. I have no intention of giving any long dissertation on any of the subjects which have been discussed; in fact, I shall occupy very few minutes of the time of the House and shall discuss only two or three, or four at most, of the points touched upon in the discussion of the speech from the Throne.

First, with regard to the amendment offered by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). That amendment in brief is to the effect that the Government should pass a franchise Bill and then bring about a dissolution and go to the country. The leader of the Opposition has been accused of playing politics in this amendment inasmuch as it is claimed that he has no fear of it carrying in this House, and therefore the question is not to be put to trial. I do not accuse him of that, because it is a disputed question whether or not we should go to the country at the present time. I think there are arguments on both sides of the question. However, I have discussed the question in my own constituency with many men who were followers of this Government, Liberals and Conservatives, supporters and friends of mine; and most of those with whom I discussed the question thought that we should not go to the country at the present time. One man who has always been a Liberal, and who I think will support the leader of the Opposition in the next election, expressed himself so strongly as to say that if we went to the country at the present time it would be an unpatriotic act. I must confess that when I hear the argument of patriotism on a question of this kind, I think that possibly there was something in what Dr. Johnson said. But I mention these things simply to show that there are great differences of opinion on this question, and as far as I have been able to gather, the majority opinion is against an election at present.

[Mr. Manion.]

One thing about the amendment that has struck me as rather strange is this: It is in effect a vote of want of confidence, yet proposes that after the Government is given a vote of want of confidence by this House it should still go on and legislate, and put on the statute books of this country a new Franchise Act. That seems to me a little strange, because if a vote of want of confidence were given, the Government would likely dissolve at once and would not attempt to put any legislation on the statute books. To my mind, irrespective of what has been said by other members, the two main arguments against the amendment are these: First, the Franchise Act is not, as implied in the amendment, the only important business to come before the House this session. There are a number of other very important matters which I think should be dealt with before this Parliament dissolves or even prorogues. One important matter that should be dealt with this session is an increase in pensions for disabled soldiers, and more particularly an increase in pensions for dependents of soldiers who lost their lives at the front. In the last session of this Parliament, the Special Committee which was appointed on Re-establishment, brought in a report that the mothers and children of soldiers who had died at the front were inadequately pensioned, and yet so far the Government and this Parliament have done nothing to make those pensions adequate. To my mind, that is a very important matter, and I do not think the House should prorogue before dealing with it.

Then there is the question of shipping, and the question of the Civil Service Act. There are 60,000 Civil Service employees in this country, and according to the press they are very much dissatisfied that classification has not been adopted or disposed of in some way. Then there is another matter on which I think this Government has been lax, and on which I hope they will bring down a policy very soon, and that is the development of our natural resources—a subject which I have brought up on a number of occasions in this House. Perhaps that is not as pressing as a number of other subjects, but I have named two or three, in addition to the new Franchise Act, which should be dealt with by the House as promptly as possible.

Another reason why I do not support this amendment is that, to my mind, it is a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and I have had no particular reason for thinking I should vote want of confi-