

vocation that the views and policies he was setting forth were those of the members of his party. Is it not true also that under the old order members of parliament, when they came together to discuss with ministers of the crown what were to be the policies, sought more or less to represent the views of the constituents who were members of their political party, and that in presenting those views they interpreted their party as meaning something more than simply their own membership. Is it not true that those for example who had been supporting them for years in the press as journalists, those who had been assisting them in various other ways to become a party in office and to be given the opportunity to make the laws of the country, were supposed to have been consulted? But what have we to-day? All this is completely changed.

The old order has gone, the Prime Minister tells us; yes, it has gone in regard to some of the things that are best, some of the things that make for security. The speech from the throne has a paragraph or two respecting the Prime Minister's plans with reference to social reform and security. But what is to become of the services and security that are to be given workers and industry if the very foundations of government are being made insecure by the method that is being taken to attain these alleged ends?

I would ask whether it is not a fact that, before His Excellency the Governor General had had any opportunity of acquainting hon. members with what was to be the business which they were called together to consider at this session, the Prime Minister of Canada himself had not declared over the radio in a broadcast that the speech from the throne would contain such and such measures, such and such policies, mentioning in specific language that they would be set forth in the speech from the throne. It may be that that is part of the new order, but I confess that, in these particulars, I rather like the old order, under which some courtesy is still extended to the crown, and some recognition taken of the crown's position in matters of the kind.

But let me go a step further. Do we not meet here to-day with statements of policy set forth in the speech from the throne, which members of the government themselves have had no opportunity carefully to consider? It is an open secret that many of the things which the Prime Minister said in his radio broadcast as to the policies of the Conservative party had never been the subject of discussion with his colleagues in council, that he was speaking on his own, giving his own plans? And in

justice to my right hon. friend, it must be said that if you read his speeches you will find that he does not speak of the plans as being those of the government, but as "my plans". And we find the same thing with regard to the designation of the government. In all his speeches my right hon. friend talks about "my government". I have in my hand a copy of the speech from the throne and I find that His Excellency the Governor General has this expression, "My government has under consideration." Whose government is it anyway, may I ask? Is it the government of the present Prime Minister or is it the government of His Majesty's representative in this country, the Governor General of Canada? I suppose, as to which it is, is a matter of the new or the old order.

Now these by some may be said to be small things, but they indicate the difference between the old order and the new. Under the old order there was such a thing as collective responsibility of the ministry; ministers held office from the crown itself and were responsible to those who were elected as the people's representatives in the house. But under this new order which we are entering upon it is "my government"; not spoken by the king or his representative but by the Prime Minister. It is not "the government" but "my government", "my ministers". That is very significant; it is exactly what we see in Italy and in Germany. We find the leader of a political party there talking about "my government", "my ministers" and the like. As one German chancellor said with respect to some of his ministers and the conditions of government as carried on in a time of autocracy, "Everyone is free to speak his own mind, but God help the one that does." As I look at the vacant seat where the ex-Minister of Trade and Commerce should be sitting to-day, I cannot help thinking that someone ventured to speak his mind but probably spoke a little too quickly. However, there is the position.

I say, the ministry has not considered this so called reform policy, has not been united upon it, knew nothing about its scope or extent or its implications, until it was announced by the Prime Minister himself. And I go a step further and say that apart from the ministry, hon. members opposite have not so much as been consulted; yet they are all members of the Conservative party, returned to this house as members of parliament and as such immediately responsible for the policies of their party. We are told that they are having a caucus. When? To-morrow