

ministry. I spoke hastily when I stated that I feared none of them had given the Prime Minister as much of their advice as they should have. Perhaps I should have said their advice is not as much heeded as it should be.

Mr. GORDON: You would be surprised.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But I do wish to make it very clear that this dominion is beginning to be resentful of its legislation being formed so exclusively according to the whim and the will and the caprice of the Prime Minister, and that the time has come now for those in parliament who believe in parliament as an institution and in the rights of the people's representatives to have some say in policy, some say in legislation and some say in matters of administration to stand up for those fundamental rights.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce will forgive me for taking a moment or two of his time—I would suggest that my right hon. friend did not answer the question I submitted to him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What question?

Mr. RHODES: I put the question to him as to whether he could point to an instance either during the lifetime of his own government or that of any other government since confederation where the ministry had submitted a resolution to the house to take its sense as to what it ought to do with respect to a money vote, the responsibility for the bringing down of which rested entirely with itself. That is the question I submitted to my right hon. friend.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would answer the question by saying that I think never since confederation has a ministry cut civil service salaries by 10 per cent. Let me add that I believe he will find that in any case where a ministry has attempted to take a course which was radical or exceptional, it has proceeded by statute or by a resolution governing the situation.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, so far as the principle is concerned, and so far as the constitutional practice is concerned, it matters not whether the estimate be reduced or increased, the responsibility in each case rests entirely upon the government of the day. That is the practice and has always been so. But my right hon. friend spoke of taking an expression of opinion of the house. If he was as keen to pursue the course he suggests as he is keen to make some capital against the min-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

istry—and with respect to that I find no fault whatsoever—the opportunity was open to him this very day, because when we moved to go into committee of supply it was competent for my right hon. friend to have moved an amendment to the motion raising the whole question of the reduction of salaries by 10 per cent and debating it to his heart's content.

Mr. VENIOT: On a bill.

Mr. RHODES: On a motion to go into supply it is competent to debate anything; there is absolutely no limit imposed on the opposition in that respect. So I say my right hon. friend has let go by one opportunity. But there will be opportunities on other occasions when we move to go into committee of supply, and my right hon. friend can then take the sense of the house in precisely the same manner as if discussing a substantive motion.

There is one other word I might say before my right hon. friend rises, and it is this: My right hon. friend has referred to the arbitrary methods of the right hon. Prime Minister and to his exercising his will and caprice upon his colleagues and upon the house and so forth. Let me say to my right hon. friend that he is taking entirely too much upon himself in assuming anything of the kind. My right hon. friend knows what ministerial responsibility means; he understands what the cohesiveness of the ministry is, and I say to him that the colleagues of the Prime Minister stand behind him one hundred per cent. When the Prime Minister speaks he speaks for the ministry as a whole, and we are very proud to have him for our spokesman.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Whatever may be the views of my hon. friend and his colleagues in regard to constitutional questions they are evidently as one on the old maxim, "United we stand; divided we fall." They are going to stand as long as they can, I have no doubt.

My hon. friend has just said I might have taken the opportunity before going into supply to move a motion of want of confidence in the government. If I had done that I believe he would have been about the first to say that I need not have resorted to that extreme method. I purposely avoided anything of the kind so that hon. gentlemen opposite, who feel that the civil servants in their own constituencies and the civil service of Canada generally, should not be treated in the manner in which they are being treated at present, by the decision of the government, would have a chance to voice their views and opinions without being told by the minister that in so doing

W.L.M. King Papers, Memoranda and Notes, 1933-1939 (M.G. 26, J 4, volume 150, pages C108741-C109340)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES  
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES  
CANADA