

do not acknowledge the corn and get out. The article states further:

If the government is able to be in office it should be able to function, and, at least to their own satisfaction, they are demonstrating that the cabinet really lacks the capacity to function. . . . Paradoxical as it may appear, the situation is that the government cannot go ahead, nor can it stop.

They are there. We are here. What are they going to do about the matter? Are we and is this country to be submitted to such humiliation as has been brought upon it by hon. gentlemen opposite whose aim is to retain their positions, for what purpose I know not? As I think I have already said, no important legislation has been enacted by this House during the past four years. The government have not a majority. They have to consult certain members of the House in order to know whether they can function and bring forward certain legislation. It is a well known fact that before this resolution for a six weeks' adjournment was submitted to the House, support for the resolution was guaranteed to the government and, consequently, they are where we find them to-day. Had those charges made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) been before the House before the motion for adjournment was submitted, I verily believe there would have been no suggestion of adjournment, but the business of the House would be going on to-day as it should be. I must protest against this attempt to blame hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for delay in carrying on the public business. It is not our fault, and we are not responsible for any additional cost, if such there be, in continuing as we are doing.

Mr. J. D. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): In reference to the last few words of the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Black, Halifax), I saw the article in question, the writer of which I know to be a gentleman who is seen around these corridors by the name of Bishop, and the subject of that article is merely propaganda. We came here at a good deal of inconvenience at this time of year, many members on this side of the House as well as others opposite, prepared to do business. We are here now ready to proceed with the business of the country and there need be no delay whatever. The cost of staying here will not be one cent more than the cost of going on holiday. What is the government going to do about it? Members of the government want a holiday to enable them to repair their bridges and their fences. Well, their business is to repair those bridges and those fences right here; let them hold

their by-elections in the ordinary course just as any other government would do. This government came here prepared ostensibly to function and it received the votes of members on the strength of its profession to be a government, and now we find that it is not. It is no government at all, for admittedly it cannot carry on. The government cannot function and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. Never will it function, so why do hon. gentlemen not get out? I see my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) opposite. Oh! if only I could command the language which he used a few years ago; I think this government would run out of the door.

Mr. CAHILL: The other one did.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): This one has not its running shoes with it, but it will have them before long. And it will not run; it will be pushed out.

I intended, Mr. Speaker to offer a few observations on the speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) but I regret that he is not in his place. Probably before I get through he will be here. The minister in his address gave us an interesting account of the negotiations that led up to the Australian treaty, but he left out a few things, and I propose, for the benefit of some of the new members of this House, to fill up the vacancies, the voids and the spaces. I would point out, what has already been called attention to, the fact that the treaty with Australia was arrived at in the fall of the year and it reached the Australian parliament during that fall. Naturally therefore the members of this House expected that when parliament met we should have the treaty presented to us. Indeed, we frequently and repeatedly asked for the treaty but never got it. In October

we saw certain telegrams and 4 p.m. cablegrams coming through to the New York papers giving a description of the treaty and some inkling as to what it involved. This government, I must say, did vouchsafe to give some information to us in a journal published by the authority of the Department of Trade and Commerce. What was that information which we received on the 6th day of October, 1924? All that was presented to this House and to the people of Canada at that time was one side of the treaty, showing just exactly what Australia was conceding to Canada; but there was not one solitary word as to what Canada was giving to Australia. I must qualify that statement; there was one word: they did tell us that we were giving the Australians free raisins. The government