

committees for the session, clearly indicating that the government did not intend to proceed with public business when they met parliament on January 7. This is a clear indication that the government deliberately deceived parliament and the country. They met parliament with not a single seat vacant in the House but failed to go on with their business. By that very fact they admitted their impotency, but still they cling to office. That shows very clearly that this side of the House is not obstructing business.

The Speech from the Throne which we have been considering since the first day of the session, has been so linked up with the motion for adjournment that we cannot pass it without agreeing that this parliament shall cease to function for five weeks. I am not opposed nor objecting to the Speech from the Throne. It means nothing; it is simply a tentative programme presented to parliament in order, if possible, to induce members of the three minor groups to vote with the government. This adjournment will lengthen the session of the House by five weeks, and I oppose that adjournment because of the added expense that it would incur, as the adjournment is part of the session. Whether parliament sits or not, the expenses of the session will go on. I have before me a clipping which I took from the Ottawa Citizen of February 10. This is an article by their special correspondent who, I think, should know what he is speaking about when he sends this broadcast to the country. He says it will and does cost \$30,000 a day to run a session of parliament. I think those figures are too high; I think the gentleman is taking into consideration, in connection with this session of parliament, expenses that are on a yearly basis, such as indemnities of members of the Senate and House of Commons, salaries of ministers and probably salaries of officials in some of the departments. But supposing we cut that in three and say that it costs \$10,000 a day—and I think even that is a high estimate—an adjournment of five weeks will cost the country \$250,000 for the mere purpose of adjourning in order that the government may be able to repair their trenches and prepare for the work which they should have had in readiness for the meeting of the House.

An adjournment in the midst of a session is the most effective measure that could be adopted to obstruct public business. It means that the House shall cease functioning, shall do no business for five weeks. Therefore I say that the government are obstructing business. They are the real obstructionists; in fact, they are the obstruction. We want that obstruction removed. We are quite

[Mr. R. K. Anderson.]

frank about it. What the country wants, the only thing that it will accept, is that this government should cease functioning and give way to another one. Business will never become normal in Canada until that is brought about. What has become of our Progressive friends to my left? Those who were in the last House spoke very frequently and loudly about wanting sessions of parliament to be convened earlier in the year. They went even so far as to say that they would like to have a session before Christmas with an adjournment until after the New Year, and then start the business of parliament early in January so that they could get away in time for their spring seeding. What has become of their farms now? Have they no spring seeding to do this year that they should become such "willing vassals" of an impotent government? I must apologize to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) for using a remark that he made in this House when he said, applying the words to this side of the House, that we were "willing vassals of a foreign power." The hon. gentleman in those words expressed volumes with regard to his attitude towards the empire. What has become of the independence of the hon. member for Labelle that he has become such a "willing vassal" of the usurper of the premier office of the Dominion of Canada? The Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King, who is so anxiously waiting for returns from Prince Albert to-day, stated very frequently while in opposition in this House that if he were made Prime Minister he would convene parliament early in January in order to meet the wishes of our friends of the Progressive party. But since he has attained office, he has failed to implement his pledges with any performance. He is something like Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, one time Labour Prime Minister of England, who very frankly admitted, after he became Prime Minister, that those things were not so easy. He made this frank admission in the British House of Commons:

In regard to our pledges and their fulfilment, why should I not confess we were a little innocent in this matter? Things which seemed very simple to carry out when we were without experience became very complicated and difficult when we became members of the cabinet responsible for them.

That is exactly the position of the Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King to-day and the government find that these things are not so easy when they are in office.

With regard to the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) a week ago to-day, may I, just for the purpose of refreshing the memories of