

cracy in industrial control. These views are on record; they have stood and will continue to stand the test of years.

I will venture a step farther and state that anyone who has read the speech from the throne and the broadcasts of the Prime Minister will discover that possibly within the last few weeks the Prime Minister himself has been reading that book.

Mr. BENNETT: No, no. I could say, "Oh that mine adversary had written a book!"

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the right hon. gentleman and other hon. members have not read it, they reveal how slight their interest in these matters really is when they have neglected this very valuable source of information.

To conclude this part of my remarks I should like very clearly to bring out one feature. You may have democracy in government combined with democracy in industry. You cannot have democracy in government combined with autocracy in industry. The latter two are as ill mated as the former are congenial. And as long as the capitalist system remains—and we find by reading between the lines in the speech from the throne the evident intention that it is to remain—a system whereby industrial policies will be exclusively controlled by capitalist investors, parliament intervening here and there to correct incidental evils only, just so long you will have no reform that is fundamental or far-reaching. The only reform worthy of the name is that which I have already described, namely reform whereby in the determination of industrial policy you give to the labour investor and to the community representing amongst others the consumers, rights equal to those of the capitalist investor.

Let me say—it would be better if the Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion) would not say "all poppycock" quite so loudly.

Mr. MANION: I did not use any such words, or any words resembling them. I am afraid something is wrong with the right hon. gentleman's hearing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I accept the minister's statement, but there are others who heard it. And may I add—

Mr. MANION: Nobody heard those words. The Prime Minister heard the words I said; I was speaking to him, not to the right hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have not any desire to enter into a discussion with my hon. friend.

Mr. MANION: I think I might have said it, though, and quite truthfully.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That comes nearer to being in line with the old order, yes. My hon. friend is running true to form.

Let me now return to the subject we were discussing previously, namely the procedure usually followed when a ministry no longer enjoys the confidence of parliament. If a ministry true to the British system of government finds it no longer enjoys the confidence of the public, it resigns or secures a dissolution and enables the people to decide for themselves whom they wish to have carry on the affairs of the country. That is doubly so where, as in the case of the present government, a ministry in addition to confessing a failure of its policies, as has been done by the Prime Minister, introduces entirely new policies which have never received the approval of the people, which are not the policies upon which those who support the government have been returned to power, but are policies of an entirely different nature. Are we in Canada to adopt the view that a ministry returned on certain policies may, if it fails, turn round and adopt diametrically opposite policies and still be entitled to carry on the government of the country? It is not possible to defend a system of government carried on in that way. No one will dispute the fact that so far as legal and technical rights are concerned, under the British North America Act, the parliamentary term is fixed for five years. But that term of five years is designated not as the period during which the ministry must hold office, but the period beyond which without a renewal of confidence on the part of the electorate it cannot continue to hold office. If such a clause were not in the act this government would never leave office, they would stay on from day to day, from month to month, from year to year, for all time. The rule and procedure is that where a ministry has not been successful in its policies, it shall make way for some other ministry capable of so doing, a ministry at all events which the people may desire.

I have said there is no doubt about the loss of confidence in the present government; I do not think I need prove that statement, the truth is everywhere known, and generally admitted. I wish however to place on record some figures which serve to indicate how emphatic the voice of the electors has been in the by-elections which have taken place. In the by-election held in South Huron on September 26, 1932, the Liberal majority was increased from 349 to 1,989. In the by-election