

morning. They are having a caucus to discuss these policies, and to-morrow they will learn the reasons why these particular policies are what they are. And they will be told exactly how they must face, and what they must say, and what they are to do, from now on. That is the new order.

But even when that step in regimentation is over there will still remain the bringing into line of the supporters of the Conservative party throughout Canada; and until we know that the Conservative party as such has favoured all these plans and is prepared to stand behind them and see that they are put into force if the party is returned to power, we shall not know whether, when the Prime Minister says, "This is Conservative policy," he speaks for his party or only for himself. These things are, I think, most significant. They may be considered as a prelude to what is to follow.

There was another part of the old order which, I believe, was important, and that was that a ministry which admitted its policies had failed and found it necessary to create new ones, before seeking to implement new policies by legislation went to the country and placed its policies before the people so as to give the people a chance to consider the new policies and to judge of their value. A ministry which had reason to believe that it had lost the confidence of the people, under the old order of the British system of government usually tendered its resignation to the crown; though some ministries, I will admit, have hung on to office for a longer time than they should. The whole spirit of the British system of government is that government is carried on, not by arbitrary powers secured by a mechanical majority, but by the consent of the governed as known, and when there is reason to believe that consent is withdrawn and that the government no longer enjoys the confidence of the people, then any government that is worthy of the name, any government that is at all true to British traditions in matters of responsible administration of public affairs, will forthwith tender its resignation, and ask that another ministry be formed, or will ask for immediate dissolution.

Can there be any doubt as to the present government not enjoying the confidence of the people? What is the present government's position in that regard? The surest way of knowing is the results of the by-elections. We have had several by-elections since the Imperial Economic Conference which was held in Ottawa in the summer of 1932 and which was referred to by the hon. member for

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe), and what has been the result? Since then, there have been ten by-elections altogether, and of the ten held in all parts of Canada the government has not carried a single by-election, with the—

An hon. MEMBER: What about Three Rivers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was part of ancient history. I am speaking of the period since the meeting here of the economic conference in 1932, and this is 1935. Since then the government has lost every by-election with the exception of one, that of East Toronto, where the Conservative candidate succeeded in getting in by a minority of the votes cast, by taking the position that he was not very enthusiastic about his leader, and by having as his chief support the ex-minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) who has since been obliged to leave the ministry.

May I say it is the more remarkable that the old order should have changed so suddenly in that the Prime Minister himself only a few months before took a sort of recognition at least of a part of the old order when he reprimanded his then Minister of Trade and Commerce for having violated what is one of the old established practices and rules of this house, namely, that of not discussing in public matters which are still within the purview of a committee of the house more especially where, as in the case of the ex-minister, he was chairman of the committee. The Prime Minister also criticized his former minister of Trade and Commerce for attempting to proceed as a royal commissioner after having made public statements, some of which, if I am not mistaken, the Prime Minister alleges were incorrect. Further, the ex-minister was asked to apologize before continuing his work as a commissioner, in order that some of the old order might still be maintained and that there might continue to be confidence in a public servant discharging a public trust. Having lectured his colleague to the extent of causing him to feel that there was nothing to do but to resign, the Prime Minister himself might have been a little more careful about preserving some of the customs and constitutional usages which are very dear to the hearts of all who love free institutions and want to see them perpetuated in this country.

But are we so sure that the old order has gone? That the old order with respect to British parliamentary methods in this parliament has gone is apparent; it has been apparent in the last few sessions. On occasions in the past