

emergency; it is making provision for some peril which is apparent and which may come in the near future.

I cannot understand the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite on this matter. They are making a demand upon this House that their way of putting things should be carried into effect; in other words, they have been saying: if you do not choose to do what we want you to do we will not allow you to do business at all. There are two political parties in this country and in this House. The Government at present in power has a majority of we will say forty. If we take one man from this side of the House as against one man from the other side of the House until we have, so to speak, paired them off on each side, there would still be thirty or forty members on this side supporting the Government. It ought to be admitted by every person that one man has as much right to his views in this House as another, but if hon. gentlemen on the other side had their way it would mean that there would be a certain number of members on this side of the House representing constituencies who would not be permitted to have a voice in public matters at all. What does the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite mean? It means government by compromise, which if carried into effect, would mean government wherein the people receive no consideration whatever. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said: We do not believe that Canada should give this \$35,000,000, and hon. gentlemen on this side say that \$35,000,000 should be given. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a perfect right to argue to endeavour to impress their opinions upon the country; they have the right to carry their opposition to this measure to the extent of impressing their opinions upon the people of Canada, and I submit that when the Opposition has argued and fought against this measure to the extent of impressing their views upon the people of Canada, they have done their duty as an Opposition and it then remains for the Government in power to put the measure through, for which, under our system of government, the people will hold the Government responsible. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a right to their opinion, but surely we on this side of the House have a right to our opinion. We say we believe we are right, and hon. gentlemen opposite say: We believe you are wrong and we will not permit you to do any business unless you agree to our terms. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that that sort of conduct is subversive of the very basic principles of responsible government. It does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say anything about responsible government, in view of their action in this

House, and least of all does it lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). If the contention of the Opposition were a proper one, it would simply mean that any aggressive opposition might say to any government, no matter what majority it had: We will not allow you to put a certain measure through; we will force you to the country unless you agree to our view. Imagine an aggressive opposition saying to the Government: We want you to bring in certain changes in the tariff; we want you to give a charter to a certain railroad, and if you do not make these changes in the tariff, and if you do not give that charter to that railway, we will not allow you to do any business and we will force you to appeal to the country. That is the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite and it is a position subversive of the very basic principles of responsible government. What is the object of all this opposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite and on the part of their leaders? We have only to examine the political life of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition to understand the course he and his followers have taken.

The CHAIRMAN: I would invite the hon. gentleman to keep as close as possible to the question.

Mr. EDWARDS: What is that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Am I out of order in my remarks, or has my time expired?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that it makes a considerable difference when an hon. member has only twenty minutes to speak, but the rule is still there that his remarks must be strictly relevant to the clause under discussion.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if my time is up, and if it is I do not want to exceed it by half a minute. I would be obliged to you if you would tell me when the twenty minutes is up. I believe that rule is a proper one and one that should have been applied in this country long before the present time.

I was about to give a reason for the opposition to this Bill. It is not because of the amount, for the Opposition has told us time and again they are not opposing this because it is \$35,000,000 and that in their generosity they would give hundreds of millions of dollars—the hon. member for Welland was going to give something like a hundred million dollars himself—it is not the question of the amount that is involved, it is simply that the position taken by the Conservative party in this country and the position taken under this Bill to which