

are mentioned in the speech from the throne? One is the Marketing Act and the other the Farmer's Debt Adjustment Act. How is the opposition's mind now upon the Marketing Act? Does it believe in it or not?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BENNETT: It has promised to repeal that act if it gets into power.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): It will amend it all right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When did it promise that?

Mr. BENNETT: It did not say amend, but repeal. I read in the press in Ontario that they said that if they were returned to power the act would be repealed, but I am glad to see signs of repentance now and recantation, as usual, with respect to anything that has proved to be useful to the people themselves. Last year day after day they opposed this act, this act that was proposed for one purpose, namely, to enable the producers of natural products to cooperate with one another for the sale of their products just as labour has cooperated, just as capital has cooperated, just as other forces have cooperated to do the best they could for themselves. They have opposed it. They have placed themselves on record as being opposed to it, yet they also opposed the provision that the government of the day might, in case of emergency, take measures for the preservation of peace, order and good government. They opposed that provision, yet I lived long enough to see the Premier of Quebec and the Premier of Ontario send a delegation to the government of the day asking them, through the combined force of the peace, order and good government provision and the marketing act—which did not apply—to take such steps as they might suggest to save the newsprint industry from demoralization. The very emergency which we thought might occur did occur; the emergency arose and the executive power was clothed with authority from this parliament to take the necessary steps.

When I hear the right hon. gentleman talk of the derogation of the rights of parliament I am surprised. I do not know that I am so much surprised as astonished, for it seems impossible that anyone who has been in this house as long as my right hon. friend has been, who has seen bills introduced and given first, second and third readings and passed through both houses of parliament, that conferred upon given individuals the authority and power to exercise certain functions if the occasion should demand, should know better than to say that this is a usurpation

of the powers of parliament. What has happened is this: Parliament, in the manner known to all, by enacting legislation has conferred those powers upon specific individuals, to be exercised in time of emergency. It will always be so, for you cannot keep parliament in session all the time to exercise its powers. So it grants or confers these powers upon the executive or upon named individuals. The power may be conferred upon the railway commission; it may be conferred upon a marketing board or some other board. It matters not; these powers are delegated by parliament to the individuals or boards that may be named. And more; the courts have declared time after time that unless and until parliament has so delegated its power there is no validity or strength in any order that may be made by any executive or board that is not clothed with such power. The privy council decided that long years ago. There must be a delegation of authority by parliament or by the dominant power to its agent or to the delegated authority which may exercise that power. That has been done on every occasion, regularly and properly, and in accordance with the institutions of this country. It has been done time after time. It always will be so until the parliamentary institutions themselves vanish. When it is suggested, as it has been; when it is whispered, as it has been, that this government or its leader desires to deprive parliament of its power, I say that the leader of the government on all occasions has not only set forth but has demanded that parliament shall, in specific terms, clothe the executive with the powers which it is desired should be exercised, before they can exercise them.

But, sir, that has not always been the case with the right hon. gentleman opposite. He set up an advisory board on tariffs and taxation, and when I asked the Minister of Justice for the power and authority to do so he had to admit that no such authority had been granted by this parliament. So we had a body that had no authority behind it for its creation, a body that was without authority for its creation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Parliament voted the money for the constitution and salaries of a tariff advisory board.

Mr. BENNETT: Parliament voted money, but the right hon. gentleman knows that did not create it. Parliament pays it, but it does not confer authority upon it to do any particular thing or exercise any power. The order in council in that case is just as harmless as the order in council, for instance,