

tion properly I might be permitted to read a sentence or two from Sir Erskine May's Constitutional History of England. Sir Erskine May says:

Party has guided and controlled and often dominated over the ostensible authorities of the State: It has supported the Crown and aristocracy against the people; it has trampled upon public liberty; it has dethroned and coerced kings, overthrown their ministers in parliament, humbled the nobles, and established popular rights. But it has protected the fabric of the Government from shocks which threatened its very foundations. The annals of party embrace a large portion of the History of England. The parties in which the British people have associated at different times and under various names have represented cardinal principles of Government authority on one side, and popular rights and privileges on the other.

The former principle pressed to extremes would tend to absolutism, the latter to a republic, but controlled within proper limits they are both necessary for the safe working of a balanced constitution.

When parties have lost sight of these principles in pursuit of objects less worthy, they have degenerated into faction.

That is what my hon. friend to whom I referred had in his mind but he lost sight of principles. That applies to the old Liberal party. I think I demonstrated this afternoon to the satisfaction of every person within hearing of my voice that that party was organized upon certain principles, that it adopted a certain platform and that it failed to carry out that platform. If the administration of the Government of the country becomes a case of the "ins" and the "outs," if that is the only issue as between parties then party degenerates, as Sir Erskine May says, into faction. That is not the case with Union Government, founded as this Government has been on a great principle, for the purpose of carrying out a great object, one of the greatest that human history has ever recorded. This is not a faction; it is a party organized for a great purpose. It is not going too far to say that this party which was organized for a purpose has stood loyally by that purpose. It was surely worth while bringing into existence for that purpose.

But something almost as good has been accomplished. Men, hundreds of them, from the different sides of politics, have mingled for the first time with their fellow Canadians on this side of the House and they have learned that after all there are very trifling differences between them. They have learned that there is not as much dividing them as they thought. Let me give an illustration as to parties. What makes a man a Presbyterian? Is it not

belief in and practice of the doctrines of the Westminster Confession? What makes a man an Anglican? Is it not belief in and practice of the doctrines of the Thirty Nine Articles? What makes a man a Roman Catholic? Is it not belief in and practice of the doctrines and tenets of the Roman Catholic church? If a man calls himself a Roman Catholic and yet believes in the Thirty Nine Articles, or the doctrine of the Presbyterian church, is he a Roman Catholic? Certainly not. Therefore I contend that when a man calls himself a Liberal, and if the platform of Liberalism is free trade and if that man practises protection to the hilt, appoints Bob Watson to the Senate, and appoints more members of Parliament to office than his predecessors ever thought of doing, he is not a Liberal at all. He may think he is but thinking that he is does not alter the case. He is what he does and what he practises. Is the point clear, Mr. Speaker? If it is not I have abundance of other evidence.

I have always contended that one of the very worst features in our system of Government is that the followers of the Government are bound by some act of the Government. For instance, the Government introduce say, a Daylight Saving Bill. I hope to the Lord they will not introduce it again this year because we members representing rural constituencies feel that our political lives are at stake if we support daylight saving. And yet, unless we vote for the Government, the Government fails.

Now that is one of the most vicious features of our party Government. I like very much better the French system, and I am going to appeal to the Acting Prime Minister, and to his colleagues, to see if it would not be possible to introduce the French system into this House. As I understand it, all measures introduced into the French *Chambre des Communes* are thrown open for action on the part of the members regardless of party. How absurd has been the spectacle in Canada for the last forty or fifty years—ever since I can remember, ever since Confederation—of a Parliament of about three hundred supposedly sensible men sitting some to the right and some to the left of the Speaker, and yet in the case of every measure that has been introduced in this House, with rare exceptions, for forty or fifty years, if it was introduced by the Government, the men to the right of the Speaker have voted yea, and the men to the left of the Speaker have voted nay, utterly regardless of the merits of the Bill, and utterly regardless