

Canada and other democratic countries will not try to make the people happy and contented, but rather hold them down as economic slaves.

The speeches of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Manion) in this debate, are simply, in my opinion, rehashings of the dreary futilities and ineptitudes of which the Canadian people grew tired and weary thirty or forty years ago. They actually dragged in the carcass of that archaic nostrum, the tariff. From the lips of two prominent members of the Liberal party I have just quoted the story of the tragic poverty and despair of the Canadian people. These are the fruits of the tariff and other policies of these two old-line parties which have alternated in power in Canada for over seventy years, or ever since confederation. Had there been anything of virtue in the tariff, surely it would have been discovered in all that time. Surely it is a waste of time to talk of tinkering with palliatives like that.

The leader of the opposition wound up by moving an amendment which, if carried, would have defeated the government and forced it to resign. The amendment regrets a number of things which we all regret. But I am very sorry to observe that the leader of the opposition does not propose to do anything about the matter.

The *Montreal Gazette* of August 12, 1938, reports that in a speech at Barry's Bay, Ontario, on August 10, 1938, the hon. gentleman told his hearers that federal governments of the past, which includes the one in which he was Minister of Railways and Canals, have done little by way of national planning of Canada's economic life, and that the time has come for action on economic problems. Again, the *Gazette* goes on:

The wealth of the country, he said, is badly distributed, hence the danger of revolution, and the need for national planning, and so on.

Again I ask the hon. member if he is correctly quoted and believes in the necessity for government planning. Has he changed his mind since the Barry's Bay speech? If so, will he tell the house why. If not, will he be consistent and vote for the subamendment which involves government planning?

There is one ancient custom in connection with the opening of parliament which, I think, should be retained because of the value of its associations. When the king's messenger knocks, and Mr. Speaker says, "Admit the messenger," I think of those heroic ancestors of several centuries ago who established the supremacy of parliament by insisting, at the risk of their lives, that even the imperious demands of the king must await the pleasure of the people's representa-

tives. May I, however, remind the House of Commons that while we are still complying with the rule which keeps even the representative of the king waiting outside the front door of the house, we have permitted a far more deadly foe to creep in through the lobbies and occupy the seats of the government itself. I say this advisedly, because everyone of these privileges and all of this power which distort and strain the relationships between the favoured few who rule this country and the plundered, profaned and disinherited farmers, fishermen and workers whom they exploit, have been derived from laws passed by either this parliament or the provincial legislatures.

I said last year, when speaking on the sweepstakes bill on May 27, 1938, that I knew of sixteen ways by which money is being made in this country to-day, all of which are unmoral, unethical and inimical to the welfare of the majority of our citizens, but all of which are none the less clothed with the force and respectability of law. I hope that later in the session these matters may be debated.

I must refer to the economic and political powers wielded by the members of our senate. The *Toronto Daily Star* of August 27, 1938, quotes from an article in the magazine *Fortune* for September, 1938. I quote:

There is no business versus government problem in Canada nor the likelihood of one, because big business and the government are closely allied, if not actually identical. Nevertheless the Canadian economy is one of the world's most precarious, because it rests upon exports, and no one to-day will even guess at the future course of world trade.

And again:

Yet another bulwark of the status quo is the inveterately patriarchal Canadian senate, the importance of its power becomes dramatically apparent when you realize the role which senators play in industry itself. There on the record for all to see is the fact that 43 senators hold 199 directorships or offices in 151 companies, whose known assets without duplication add up to eight billion five hundred million dollars.

This means average company assets per senator of the colossal sum of \$200,000,000. When it is realized that this non-elective body, the members of which hold office for life, has the power of absolute and perpetual veto over all the laws passed by the commons, it should be a subject of serious consideration for Canadians.

I turn now for a moment to the trade situation. Professors Leven, Moulton and Warburton, in their studies for the Brookings Institution, show that for the year 1929 in the United States, 36,000 families, or one tenth of