

Mr. EULER: If my right hon. friend will allow me—how could this test be applied to the changes which were made last session and those which are being made this session?

Mr. BENNETT: I am saying we are endeavouring to do that very thing.

Mr. EULER: To the ones being made now?

Mr. BENNETT: No, we are endeavouring to set up a tribunal which will do that. Human nature is always prone—with other considerations, with pressure of politics, with pressure of everything in connection with other affairs—to arrive at conclusions which are not judicial conclusions in respect to these matters; but every change made in the tariff submitted last September or at present is made upon a fixed principle to which I have so often alluded. I still believe that no tariff board is worthy the name in this country that does not realize that if once we conclude to engage in manufacturing on any scale—and we have concluded that this country is to be an industrial country—then the first consideration must be that with increasing efficiency as the days go by Canadians shall have an equal opportunity with their competitors to produce in this country. It is something which apparently my hon. friends opposite cannot understand, but I put this to any of the hon. gentlemen opposite—to my friends in the corner: Do you say that Canadians in this new, young country, endeavouring to build a nation, having embarked upon an industrial career as we have, should not have an equal opportunity with their chief competitors in other countries to make a success of the business in which they are engaged?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Certainly, we say they should.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And they have.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. Then if my hon. friends mean it is only a question of a degree, if they say so, I say the best answer to that is with this tribunal provided by this bill we will have the answer to what is the necessary degree. There are the principles and that is the reason the provision is made for the tenure of office that I have indicated. I do not believe that men can do the best work that is in them in judicial positions—and this board is a judicial body—if they are all the time thinking of other considerations. A leading man of this country said to me when I asked him the possibility of getting good men, "Oh, that is impossible." He said, "Who will work for \$12,000 a year when, if

[Mr. Bennett.]

he has the ability which enables him to deal with these questions, he will make \$25,000 in private life?" That is the reason why, in this bill, provision has been made for the future of those men who serve a number of years, so that while having regard to other salaries paid in this country to judges and others we dare not—and when I say that I mean we should not—pay so large a salary to these three men as will put them out of line with all the others, we have made provision for their future so that if the tenure is interfered with at least they will realize that some provision has been made for them. We believe that thereby we will secure the best service possible in this country. A very distinguished Canadian said to me not long ago, "Mr. Bennett, the time has come when our country must realize that we must pay larger salaries in order to get results in government, as we do in business." You cannot do it if you expect men to leave the certainty of the positions which they occupy and take positions under government without giving them some certainty of tenure and some stability so they may feel that they are occupying positions judicial in character, and making a contribution to the well-being of this country. I am sure the men who occupy these positions will realize their obligations and responsibilities to the state. I want to say further that certainly they will do it, as far as I am concerned, without any suggestion from me as to how they should proceed in so far as party politics are concerned. I can only say that.

It was only a short time ago that I heard it said, and it appeared in one of the newspapers, that this government would not appoint a tariff board because the great manufacturers of the country did not want such a board, and it was suggested that this government had not sufficient courage to create this board. Now we are told that we are to be condemned because we are doing it, and that we are doing it for the feudal barons of the country. Now, sir, just let me make this observation at this point: What does the right hon. gentleman mean by those words which flow so glibly from his tongue on every occasion, "feudalism," and "courts provided for the lords of the country"? What does he mean by "rivetting," "shackling," "ulterior motives," "sinister purposes"? What do all these words mean? Who are these men; who are these people against whom these attacks are levelled? Who are these men who are thus sneeringly held up to execration and disdain in this House of Commons and