

each appealing for the right to govern, makes it important that, before entrusting any of them with office, you should be fully satisfied that the one of your choice is not only willing, but is in a position to carry out what it professes it will do. The mere assumption of office by a political party is no guarantee that its promises or pledges will be carried out. That has been unmistakably demonstrated during the past five years. Mr. Bennett made promises galore, and was more than emphatic about every one of them. He would end unemployment. He would abolish doles. He would blast his way into the markets of the world. Has he accomplished any one of these things? If he has not, he certainly cannot argue that he has not had sufficient majority behind him in the Commons and has not had a majority in the Senate which has steadily increased. His failure is obviously due to the fact that his policies were at fault, and that no government on earth could have carried out the promises he made.

Mere power, even absolute power, on the part of a political leader, is no guarantee that what he says he will do, will be carried out. Even the absence of opposition to widely heralded measures of social reform, is no guarantee that, as introduced, or when enacted, they will be of any account. Mr. Bennett's so-called "New Deal" has made all this abundantly clear. Something more than promises, professions, and platforms is needed to enable a political leader to give effect to important measures and policies. The party, as a whole, must be whole-heartedly behind them. Policies and measures must have been brought into being as the result of much in the way of consideration and conference. They must be suited to the country as a whole. They must, from time to time, have received the party's endorsement, through organiza-

tions representative of all classes and in all parts of the country; they must have the cordial support of the party's members in the country, and of its representatives in Parliament; and they must have public opinion behind them.

#### Bennett a One-Man Government

Until Mr. Bennett, without prior consultation with members of the Conservative party, took it into his own hands to say what the party would do, what its program was to be, as he did, so largely, in the general elections of 1930, and, so completely, in his radio broadcasts in January last, no political leader in Canada had ever so much as thought of doing a thing of the kind. Sir John A. Macdonald never did it. Sir Wilfred Laurier never did it. It has never been done in Great Britain. On the continent of Europe it is done, it is true: by Mussolini, in Italy; by Hitler, in Germany; by Stalin, in Russia. The Leader in those countries has become everything; everybody else is of little or no account. He must be featured to the exclusion of everyone else; political propaganda must give favorable significance to his every utterance; no opinion contrary to his is to be tolerated.

But do we want that sort of thing in Canada? And will it succeed in this country? Never forget that, in Italy, in Germany, in Russia, it has all been brought about in the name of social reform; but at the price of political freedom. It means the end of self-government, of democratic government, of government by parliament, of government even by cabinet. I think that, perhaps, in Canada, we already have had enough of one-man government.

As the leader of the Liberal party, it has not been necessary for me to frame the party's policies. That