

*The Address—Mr. Gregory*

government, then, to take all necessary power, and let us get on with the running of the war.

To those who fear the loss of democracy, who fear the setting up of a dictatorship in war time through boards, commissions and controllerships, and who would remedy these alleged grievances by the appointments of under-secretaries, may I say most emphatically that the proposed remedy bears no relationship to the alleged wrong.

For a moment let us consider this: What are under-secretaries? First of all, they are members of parliament. They are, therefore, responsible to their constituencies and to parliament, as private members. This is a purely representative capacity. Then, second, they are assistants to the ministers, and are empowered to act for them and to speak for them in parliament and in the country, within the limits of the ministers' policies and the general policies of the government. Again, the duties and functions of an under-secretary are purely representative. In the second instance, they represent the minister and the government, and that is all. Those are the functions of under-secretaries.

What about these boards, controllers and commissions? In peace-time we are very clear about the relationship between a minister and the staff under him, who carry out his instructions and whom we call civil servants. They receive orders from the minister, and it is their duty to see that the mechanical or practical work is carried out on his orders. But war-time has thrown an emergent responsibility upon every minister to create boards, commissions and controllerships to perform specific war-time jobs. All these boards, commissions and controllerships, however, operate under some minister. They must confer with the minister; they must accept the minister's policy; they cannot go beyond the policy established by the minister or by the government of the day. Therefore, sir, in a very real sense these appointees are only a temporary war-time civil service, and in no way are their functions similar to those of under-secretaries. I welcome the appointment of under-secretaries to overworked ministers.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I read with very great satisfaction another passage in the speech from the throne:

... a comprehensive national scheme of social insurance should be worked out at once which will constitute a charter of social security for the whole of Canada.

Knowing the life history of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), I would have been very much surprised indeed if in this fourth year of war provision had not been made in the speech from the throne for

[Mr. Gregory.]

greater security and a happier nation after this war is won. I remember the Prime Minister as a student of humanities at the university. I remember him as a post-graduate on social problems. I remember his journey through Europe, following his student days, studying the social conditions of the masses. I remember him as the first commissioner of labour, as the first deputy minister of labour and, later, as the second Minister of Labour. I know something of the splendid contribution he made under the Rockefeller foundation during the first great war in harmonizing the differences of employers and labour in the United States. Therefore it is not surprising to read the words which were delivered by the Prime Minister at the lord mayor's luncheon in London on September 4, 1941, when he said:

Much is being said about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out at some given moment or reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and seals. That was one of the mistaken beliefs at the end of the last war.

A new world order, to be worthy of the name, is something born, not made. It is something that lives and breathes, something that needs to be developed in the minds and hearts of men, something that touches the human soul. It expresses itself in good-will, in mutual aid. It is the application in all the human relations of the principle of helpfulness and service. It is based not on fear, greed, hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method cooperation.

Therefore, sir, the Prime Minister has run true to form in the speech from the throne and has followed Liberal traditions established during the long and useful career of the Liberal party in both Great Britain and Canada. Again Liberalism has been true to its past history, "Humanity First". With the implementing of the recommendations of the committee on social insurance, I am sure we shall all welcome the day after this war when we can assuredly say that we have made a land fit for heroes to live in, that we have made of life a journey to be enjoyed rather than a burden too heavy to be borne. We said that after the last war, but with shame were forced to admit that we had done nothing to implement the statement. That will not be so after this war.

Again referring to the speech from the throne, I note with very great pleasure the broadening of Canada's diplomatic relations with other countries. This is just another indication of Canada's growing importance within the British commonwealth of nations.