

An amendment moved to the motion to go into Committee of Supply or Ways and Means does not necessarily involve a want of confidence in the Administration.

I would suggest to the leader of the Government that he pay less attention to the Pilgrim's Progress and more to Bourinot and parliamentary procedure.

The minister talks about waiting. This game of waiting does not appeal to live, progressive people. If the leader of the Government is so particularly strong on waiting, on teaching pupils what they ought to do, and on bringing his children to task, he should give his attention to some hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House who should have waited. The minister had a gun, so to speak, put at his head the other day, and he was told that unless certain things happened within a certain set time, His Honour the Speaker would have in his hand a certain set of resignations which would bring the hon. gentleman to his milk. And that was with regard to the tariff question.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will pardon me for correcting him, but I have never even heard of such a suggestion, let alone receiving any intimation of that character.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman must have been absent on his Pilgrim's Progress, for that statement was made in the House the other evening by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg). If my hon. friend will look up that speech he will find the intimation word for word just as I have given it, except that the hon. member did not say he was holding a pistol at the head of the Acting Prime Minister; but that was what he was doing. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie), that veteran war-horse and leader of the Ginger Group, that real true-blue Tory, spoke in the House the other night not only of putting a gun to the head of the Government, but of a Government funeral unless certain things were done, and he was not satisfied with an ordinary funeral but predicted a state funeral unless the leader of the Government pronounced himself along certain lines of action. We have also had a spectacle since Parliament met such as I have never seen before in this House. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) was not willing to wait. He was put up, I presume, upon the advice and direction of the leader of the Government. He fully understands his position as a minister of the Crown; he knows the practice that ought to govern ministers who sit together in Council, and I venture to say—at least I

[Mr. McKenzie.]

hope I am right in saying—that when he stood up in this House he did not give a full explanation, an open-book account, so to speak, of the deplorable condition of the finances of this country. When he was asked why he did not wait for the budget he said he was not giving a budget speech but was disclosing the financial condition of this country, which should be remedied if possible. The question of finance having already been dealt with by cabinet ministers and by supporters of the Government, it cannot therefore be improper for hon. members on this side of the House to put their cards on the table and say to the Government and to this country, as we ought to say: We do not know what the Government proposes to do, as we have no means of knowing, but we appreciate the necessities of this country, and we know what should be done to meet them. We are simply saying to the people of this country: This is what we are prepared to do, and we ask your opinion upon our policy. That is the proper course to take. We have no business to go behind closed doors and conceal our ideas on the tariff. I might say to the leader of the Government that I never knew when he was willing openly to discuss what he was going to do about the tariff. His plan always has been to go behind closed doors and do what he proposes to do with regard to the tariff by Order in Council. He will not trust this House on a matter of that kind, because it might lead to a vote of want of confidence in himself and his colleagues.

So long as they can govern by Order in Council, this fifth wheel of a coach, as they treat this Parliament in matters of this kind, has nothing at all to do with it. "We will do it by Order in Council," they say, "and the thing will be in operation before Parliament knows anything about it." Let me remind our western friends, who are particularly concerned in the tariff, that when this matter was adjusted under Order in Council we on this side of the House said, "If you are in good faith with the West and mean what you have done, confirm it by statute; make it absolute for the people of the West for all time to come." There are some hon. members on the opposite side to-day who sat on this side on that occasion and voted for our resolution, while every Tory on that side of the House voted against it and said that it would be merely an Order in Council, and that when the proclamation was issued repealing it, the Order in Council would be void. That, Sir, is not the way that Liberals on this side of the House intend to deal with the people