

to which those gentlemen belong, it is a mistake, and should not dominate the policies of any country. Usually it serves a purpose which is not at all the one that they have in view.

There are two classic examples in contemporary times. Take the election campaigns of President Roosevelt, both the last one and the one in 1936. Practically the whole great press of the United States was fighting President Roosevelt. The house knows what the result was. The opinion of the press was certainly not public opinion. The same thing occurred in England not very long ago, when the great newspaper combinations controlled by Lord Rothermere and Lord Beaverbrook tried to establish empire free trade. They were very outspoken, even vociferous about it, but their views were not the public opinion of England nor the public opinion of the British dominions. May I quote in that respect the words of an article that I read yesterday—well, yes, I read these things even on Sundays—in the *Political Quarterly*, an important English publication:

But it can be noted that every time the press conducts a campaign which is pure published opinion, it has the effect of making many people puzzled and suspicious. By tampering with opinion, by regarding public opinion as a vague word which can be raked out to support an editorial argument, the press plays with fire.

The press would be working in its own long-term interests, if it always took its responsibilities to the public 100 per cent seriously and if it asked itself frequently the question to which a preliminary answer has been attempted here: "What is public opinion?" But the deeper question for democracy and far-seeing leadership, and one needing a regular, accurate, objective answer, is "What is private opinion?"

May I speak of one newspaper which is very prominent in this campaign in my own province—the *Montreal Gazette*? I am a personal friend of the editor of the *Gazette* and of his representative in the press gallery, and I should not like to say anything that might be unpleasant. But do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the *Montreal Gazette* represents the opinion, I will not say of the province of Quebec, but of the English-speaking citizens of that province? Not long ago we had a federal election. I took part in that election in the very community in which the *Montreal Gazette* operates. The *Gazette* was then advocating national government, as it is to-day. My two dear old friends, Mr. White and Mr. Cahan, both representing strong and traditionally Conservative constituencies, and very good men indeed, were defeated because their election campaigns were engineered by or supported by the *Montreal Gazette*. The same thing happened in the provincial election a few months ago. It might appear bold on

my part, but I venture to say that I represent the views of the English-speaking electorate of Montreal better than does the *Montreal Gazette*. When some editors speak on behalf of the people of Canada, it reminds one of the tailors of Tooley street speaking for the people of England.

Is it certain that a union government, if it were formed, would be strong as far as the confidence of the country is concerned? Yes, we had a union government; it carried the country in 1917. I do not want to re-criminate or to give any reasons which might lead to a discussion. But as soon as that general election was over, there were by-elections throughout Canada, during the whole term of that union government, and everywhere the government was overwhelmingly defeated. In all the provinces of Canada, except in the case of ministers who, at that time, had to go to the electors after being asked to join the government, the candidate of the union government was defeated. And, mind you, all those constituencies had elected union government supporters in 1917.

In Ontario that happened in Glengarry and Stormont, Ontario North, Peterborough West, Temiskaming. I will not refer at length to Quebec; it is not necessary to do more than call attention to Quebec East, Kamouraska, and the St. James division of Montreal. But in New Brunswick there was Victoria and Carleton where Mr. Carvell, upon being appointed to the board of railway commissioners, was replaced by Mr. Caldwell with a big majority. In Saskatchewan, when Mr. Turriff was appointed to the senate, the union government candidate was defeated. Is this a good record on which to recommend similar government at this time? No, Mr. Speaker.

The internal advance of democracy depends upon giving expression to the will of the people. Nazism and fascism have nothing new in them, because they are merely the old sort of tyranny when a government was seized or set up by a group instead of being selected by the people of the country. Even those who clamour for a national government say that there must be a strong opposition, and they are right. An opposition is a necessary part of a democratic parliament. It has duties to perform as important as those of the members on the government side. Do any of my hon. friends believe that the joining together of all groups in a government is desirable if it has the necessary effect of further weakening the opposition? I do not. I reiterate my plea to the promoters of this proposal not to persist in an endeavour that will be detrimental to the cause which we all desire to serve.