

of the millions and hundreds of millions which it has had in hand during the last four years. I think it is time that we should have a full and clear statement of our financial situation. We are to launch into vast expenditures. Before doing so should we not know exactly where we stand? Should we not be told what are our obligations—what we owe in England for the maintenance of our army and what is our total indebtedness? Before plunging into a large programme of expenditure, we should know what is the total burden we already have to carry in order that we may know whether we can add anything to it. Every one in this country must wonder how we shall meet our annual charges. Spending is easy when money is coming easily. We are borrowing. There will come the day when payment must be made, when interest on our loans must be paid. How will we find the money and who will be made to pay? Is it not time to revert to normal budgets? The Ottawa Journal lately gave the following list of expenditures as estimates which the two Houses of Parliament would be asked to vote:

Estimated war expenditure next year	\$225,000,000
Current or civil expenditure	150,000,000
Pensions (estimated)	25,000,000
Interest on debt and other fixed charges	75,000,000
Soldiers' gratuities (estimated)	65,000,000
Shipbuilding programme	55,000,000
Projected public works	20,000,000
Railway improvements	60,000,000
Probable railway deficits	10,000,000
Federal grants to highways	25,000,000
Grants to technical education and housing scheme	25,000,000
Total	\$735,000,000

Now, no one to this day knows—I doubt if any one in this Chamber knows—what is our total indebtedness. If no one knows our total indebtedness, no one can say what is the total annual charge that henceforth will weigh upon our finances; and it seems to me that, before we are asked to incur expenditures which may amount to a billion this year, we should know exactly where we stand in order that we may face the situation like men. Now that the war is over, is it not time to revert to normal life? And if it is time to return to normal life I ask the Government to repeal with one stroke all the Orders in Council which were passed during the last four years and to restore Parliament to its proper role as the natural, logical representative of the people in a democratic country. We have been governed in an abnormal time by abnormal methods. I heard Mr. Balfour in the other Chamber, when he graced that

Chamber with his presence, speak of the advantages of autocracy in times of stress. Well, we have been governed by autocracy. We have had our kings, some smiling ones, and good natured, like the honourable gentlemen facing me, but all the same we have been governed by autocracy. That word implies tyranny, and sometimes anarchy as well. Shall we revert to the old traditions of parliamentary life? I hope so.

There are certain principles which have prevailed for centuries, but which during the last four years have been sent to the four winds. One of them, which is typical, I would like to mention. I refer to the defeat on the 17th of December last of the Postmaster General in the two constituencies which he contested in the province of Quebec. In England, since the Succession to the Crown Act of 1707, we have had the principle clearly established that a member of Parliament who accepts office has to vacate his seat and go to the people. A portion of the Act reads as follows:

If any member shall accept of any office of profit from the Crown during such time as he shall continue a member, his election shall be, and is hereby declared to be, void, and a new writ shall issue for a new election as if such person so accepting was naturally dead; provided, nevertheless, that such person shall be capable of being again elected.

This was the law of England from 1707 to 1915. Many attempts have been made during the last seventy-five years to repeal that Act, but those attempts have always failed. A member of the British House of Commons who accepted office thereby vacated his seat and went to the people. If he was defeated, he was permitted to retain his office for a short period and to try his luck in another riding. I have yet to learn of a precedent, and I will ask my honourable friend to inform me if he has been more successful than I have been in finding a single instance during those two hundred years of a cabinet minister who has been enabled to retain his position in the Cabinet by being appointed to the House of Lords. I have not found a single instance to that effect. We ourselves have a similar Act which is to be found in the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 10, under the head "Independence of Parliament." It says:

No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance, emolument, or profit of any kind is attached; and

(b) No sheriff, registrar of deeds, clerk of the peace, or county crown attorney in any of