

Mr. MANION: The hon. member did not expect me to quote all his works.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, but I would like the hon. member to quote the last reasoned statement of the authority, and not to go back and pick out that which for the moment suited him, and I do not blame him any more than I blame the hon. member to my right. I am quoting now from page 10 of *Home Rule in Practice*, by Arthur Berriedale Keith in 1921:

The British rule has of late been followed in Canada as regards the Dominion government, in New Zealand, and the Union, but it is not yet established in the Canadian Provinces or Newfoundland.

And therefore all the provincial precedents quoted by my hon. friend have no direct application whatever to the situation which faces us here, because so far as the provinces are concerned they are dragging along, perhaps a step or two behind us, but they will soon come in line if my hon. friend will permit them. The citation proceeds:

The explanation is obvious: it is in the larger communities alone that there has been fully developed that sense of political responsibility among ministers which would render intervention by the Governor unwise and dangerous.

I emphasize those words, and I say to hon. members opposite that their attitude in this matter is unwise and dangerous. They have not acted with due recognition of the immense responsibility of their position at the moment. I turn again to another publication of the same authority, published in 1924, somewhat more up to date, and entitled *The Constitution, Administration and Laws of the Empire*, and on page 155 I find the following:

It might seem at first that the crown should be free to refuse a dissolution to a defeated ministry, as is still the rule in the dominions but there is no doubt such action would be unwise, and in view of invariable usage since Victoria's reign unconstitutional.

And the hon. acting minister would implant for all time, as a definite precedent, that the prerogative of the crown should be exercised in all cases wherever he so desired.

Mr. MANION: Oh no, I did not say that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well, that is the implication. If my hon. friend establishes the precedent which he seeks to establish to-night he cannot escape that implication.

Mr. MANION: I simply suggest that he has the right to do it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I accept the position taken by the hon. member, and I
[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

suggest that it is infinitely more worthy of him than the implication his first utterance would carry. The quotation continues:

The electors are the true sovereign authority, and ministers who advise dissolutions are entitled to ask from them judgment on their deeds.

Again at page 209, I find:

The constitutional usage in the dominions has not yet laid it down that as regards the demand for a dissolution, the Governor must act on ministerial advice, although there are signs that this convention is on the way to be recognized in the more important cases. It was noted in 1914 that Sir R. Munro-Ferguson (now Viscount Novar), granted a double dissolution of the Commonwealth Parliament to a ministry with a bare majority in the lower House and scarcely any representatives in the upper. His predecessors in office had declined previous proposals for dissolution on the score that the possibilities of finding another ministry to carry on government without troubling the electors had not been exhausted, and had he acted on the same principle, it might have been possible to avoid a dissolution but he wisely conformed to the British precedents instead.

And I say it would have been much wiser if in our case His Excellency had been advised to adhere to previous constitutional practice.

That is the volume of 1924, entitled, *The Constitution, Administration, and Laws of the Empire*, by A. Berriedale Keith.

Miss MACPHAIL: It sounds patriotic anyway.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes. The question of our national status is inevitably involved in this matter, and I for one will not be a party to a retrograde step which will take from the people of the country one vestige of the authority which they have secured. All honour to Sir Robert Borden, all honour to Arthur Meighen when he acted as he did at the Imperial conference, and I am satisfied that if he now held the views he held at that time he would not be acting the way he is acting at present. What has converted him? Is it political exigencies, is it the pressure of the need for partisan advantage, or what is it? I am at a loss to understand his change. I say the majority of the people of Canada will look with the greatest disapproval upon such a course, and they will register their disapproval in no uncertain terms should an election be forced upon them on this issue. There is not the vestige of a chance of hon. members opposite succeeding in an election fought out on this issue, and they dare not try it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a very confused idea of the status of these acting ministers. There is no authority to which I can definitely look with any hope of complete satis-