

the Prime Minister has criticized me and hon. gentlemen on this side for having taken up a considerable amount of the time of the house in discussing constitutional questions. May I say that we have done so because we have looked upon the constitution of our country as the safeguard of its liberties and as the home of its freedom. When I have seen steps taken which I have believed were gradually dismantling the constitution, gradually destroying the home of the freedom and liberties of the people, I have opposed them just as strongly as I possibly could, and I shall continue to do so no matter by what name measures of the kind may be designated. I shall continue to look with a great deal of care, not upon the alleged but upon the real purpose lying back of each and every measure as disclosed by some of its provisions. That has been the occasion of such opposition as the Prime Minister has had in this house to any measures he has introduced. The opposition has not been to what was good in any measure; it has been to what there has been of stealthy alienation of the authority and control of parliament over many aspects of public affairs. I shall not at this time enumerate them; I may however, follow the Prime Minister's example by saying a few words over the radio some evening and on that occasion I shall attempt to set forth some of these alienations of the authority and control of parliament, and to answer some of the Prime Minister's statements.

It was hardly a chivalrous thing on the part of the Prime Minister to take advantage of the period between the first of the year and the assembling of parliament, notwithstanding the violation of all precedents, to go on the air for six nights in succession, with an interval of, I think, one evening between each broadcast, and, in this favoured position, not only to state his own policies, but to undertake to state what were the policies of the Liberal party and what the Liberal party had and had not done. The most extraordinary of all his performances was the last one of the series delivered over the radio, in which the Prime Minister engaged in that heroic shadow-boxing with myself which entertained the public from one end of Canada to the other. We all know his love for monopolizing the powers of the legislature and the functions of the executive, but in this recital he appeared in a new role; this time he undertook to monopolize the functions of the judiciary. I am not surprised at that; I am not surprised at anything the Prime Minister may do in the way of monopoly effort of one kind or another. He must have the stage to himself, even though

all his colleagues be crowded out of sight. The Prime Minister has said that he thought the judiciary was a more important branch of government than the legislative or the executive branches. I must say that I thought it was an extraordinary position for the head of a government to take. However, that is what he has said; so I was not surprised when, the other evening, I saw the importance he was attaching to the judiciary.

What did he do? Well, not satisfied with being the presiding judge, he began at once to act as prosecutor. As leader of the opposition, I was the poor victim, the prisoner in the dock. He started his prosecution, but he went a step further. He constituted himself also counsel for the defence, and began to defend me. I confess that, as I listened at the radio that night, I said to myself, "Heaven help me if I am in that man's hands for defence. I do not believe, however, the public will be quite so dense as to believe that what he is saying about my party and myself is correct, or that all the admissions he is making on my behalf are accurate." But that was not all; he was the jury as well. He presented the case to the jury, both as prosecuting attorney and counsel for the defence. Then, after the jury had retired in this imaginary scene, he came in as judge and pronounced that the Liberal party stood for *laissez-faire*, that it never stood for anything else, and that what Canada needed to-day was government control of all industry, that there must be a policy of interference with industry, a policy of state intervention. This was to be called reform; reform, that was to be the issue. Well, that may be part of the new order, but I tell the Prime Minister that it is a pretty cheap order.

But again may I ask are we so sure about the passing of the old order? We know that much that was best in it is passing, but what about the worst? What was the old order? Essentially, in the minds of the people, the old order is that order of things which pertained to the days of feudalism, an order that stands for autocracy in government, in industry and in social relations. Feudalism with its various embroideries and accessories of one kind or another. I wonder if the restoration of titles in this country is a part of the new order, these knights and ladies that the Prime Minister is determined to bring back to the scene, as the all important personages in our midst, knights and ladies of the order of St. Michael and St. George, of the Order of the Bath, of the Order of the British Empire. Are all these part of the old order that has gone, or are they part of the new deal, the new order that we are to have? I must say that