

commences with Walpole in 1721 and deals with the prime ministers down to 1921, and points out how, under the development of the system of cabinet responsibility, the cabinet is a committee of parliament. It does not follow that all the members of the cabinet belong to the House of Commons, and indeed when I look at the composition of the present alleged government I find that two of them have been compelled to find their domicile and resting place—not only two but three—in the Senate. So that the cabinet is not entirely the creation of the Commons. It is not entirely composed of members of the Commons. It is composed of members of the Commons and the Lords. In the early days the monarch was able to govern for himself. George III tried to govern the country by himself. In the introduction to this book these words appear:

In England prime ministers are a comparatively modern institution. In the days of the Norman and Plantagenet monarchs the king himself directed and carried on the government of the country by the advice of his council. This he did through his own officers and largely from his own revenues. Usually he chose these officers himself, though at times they were forced upon him. For the most part they were priests, the medieval ecclesiastics possessing considerable advantages over laymen in the way of education and of freedom from family ties. They often rose to great power and rivalled the King himself. Such were Flambart, Becket, Beaufort and Wolsey. Soldiers like de Montfort and Warwick were rarer and less permanent, while courtiers of the Gaveston or Despenser type had the least success. Most of these ministers, except occasionally the prelates, belonged to the nobility.

But after the Wars of the Roses nearly all the old families had disappeared. When Henry VII came to the throne the lay peers only totalled twenty-nine, one-third of what their numbers had been a hundred and fifty years earlier. The influence of the church was also diminishing, whilst two new classes, the landed gentry and the city merchants, were rapidly becoming literate and acquiring importance. The names of Howard, Seymour, Cecil, Cavendish and Russell now first rise into prominence, and the House of Commons is really beginning to count. After the commencement of Queen Elizabeth's reign there are only two instances of a bishop being Lord Chancellor or Lord Treasurer, while the Secretaries of State have ceased to be clerks. Nevertheless the sovereign is still paramount, presiding himself at his council and personally selecting his ministers.

Then we have further:

In 1688 another advance was made. The arbitrary power of the crown was definitely checked. Parliament became almost supreme, and a certain responsibility was compelled from the administration. King William, who acted largely as his own minister, took an active and constant part in the government, but Queen Anne devolved more and more of her duties upon her councillors. Then came a fresh development. A foreign prince succeeded to the throne. Entirely dependent on the goodwill of a parliamentary majority, and speaking hardly any English, he could not effectively control that committee of the council which was gradually growing into a cabinet. He was averse to

political business and became attached to a single minister. The minister, who led the House of Commons, was also the leader of the Whigs and was supported by the great families of the Revolution.

Then I pass his discussion of the Prime Minister and how he came into being, but he continues:

The Prime Minister, besides being the leader of the government and of that house of the legislature in which he sits, is almost invariably the leader of one of the chief political parties, or of a section of one.

There is no doubt that the sovereign no longer selects his ministers. That day is past. He selects his chief minister and his chief minister submits for approval to the sovereign or his representative the names of the members of his cabinet. As my learned and hon. friend says, they may be out of parliament for the moment. They are entrusted with the responsibility of taking action collectively or individually with the cabinet in council. The last case I know of a ministry resigning with one member, an appointee of the sovereign, not resigning, was before confederation in Nova Scotia when a motion was carried by twenty-nine to twenty-two against the government and the premier resigned. All his colleagues went out of office except one, and that one, the selection of the representative of the sovereign, he had himself to dismiss. Hon. members will recall that in this House when the Minister of Railways resigned in 1907, he directed his letter of resignation not to the representative of the sovereign, but to the Prime Minister for the time being, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. So it is that those who hold office under the crown no longer are the servants of the crown in the sense in which that term was used in the days of the Georges, but are now dominated, to use the language of the books, by the Prime Minister. He is the dominant member of the Cabinet. He must, from necessity, be a member of the cabinet. He must, from necessity, be a member of the Privy Council. But the other members that comprise and constitute that Privy Council are subordinate to him. The position is shortly put in these words in a book which was published late last year:

The essential characteristic of the Prime Minister's position is his right to choose the other ministers, as the essence of his power is the indispensability conferred upon him by the turn of party politics.

Then the writer proceeds and I commend this to the consideration and attention of the House:

As in this latter respect, so in the former also, Pitt's career was of decisive importance. George III's efforts to control the composition of cabinets had won a great success in Pitt's accession to power; even at their least successful they had always been effective