MR. MEIGHEN'S SPEECH.

Marie Man Street Will

tion of representative govern-ment".

The text of the Hamilton speech shows that what Mr. Meighen actually proposed was that, on the outbreak of war, the Govern-ment should make its decision, tly, and act on it; but that be troops were sent overseas, the Government's decision should be submitted to the people at a general election.

Is this "a negation of representative government"? common ground among authorities on the Constitution that a general election is proper whenever there is a great new question of public policy at issue. A decision to send troops overseas, taken by a Government elected on purely peace-time issues, surely qualifies as a great new question of public policy. Mr. Baldwin, in 1923, dissolved a Parliament elected only a year before in order to seek a mandate for a protective tariff. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, in 1931, dissolved

Parliament in order to get a "doc-mandate" on fiscal policy. John A. Macdonald in 1891, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1911, dissolved Parliament to seek a mandate on the question of reci-procity. Were these actions "negations of representative govern-ment"? Mr. Meighen himself has told us that Sir Robert Borden's Government, in 1914, very seriously contemplated precisely the course of action suggested in the Hamilton speech. Would that have been "a negation of representative government"?

EUGENE FORSEY.

Piccadilly avenue, Ottawa, Dec. 12, 1942.

EDITOR'S NOTE-Mr. Forsey apparently does not see the difference between a Prime Minister asking the people to tell him what to do or not do—which Mr. Meighen advocated—and dissolving Parliament to submit a declared policy by which the Government, could stand or fall, which was what Sir John Mac-donald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier

MEIGHEN PAPERS, Series 6 (M.G. 26, I, Volume 222)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES CANADA