

elsewhere? Who are these men who are spoken of as the lords of special privilege and whose rights are contrasted with those of the people? They are our fellow Canadians; they are men who have made their way in this country by dint of courage, enterprise, skill and ambition.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron): And special privileges.

Mr. BENNETT: Special privileges? What are they? The hon. gentleman glibly uses the words used by his leader. What is a special privilege? A special privilege is one which appertains only to the individual or the class, and there is nothing of that kind here. Every man may engage in any trade or business in this country which is not prohibited by law, and I know of but few. If, as a result of his efforts, by his vision, his ambition, his foresight, his energy and his industry he achieves success, is he to be held up to ignominy and shame by the right hon. gentleman opposite and spoken of as a lord of the feudal days desiring special privileges? But I notice that at election time the party of my right hon. friend is always around where they are, and I resent as much as any man can resent these attacks against Canadians who have achieved some measure of success; whose success you glory in when it serves your purpose at election time and vilify because you think it is cheap clap-trap politics in the intervening time.

These are the things that make one wonder whether after all it is worth while to endeavour to make an honest effort to place upon the statute books of this country a measure which will enable men to have a tribunal to which they may appeal, which will not be political in its character, but composed of men who will have an ambition to serve the state. My own observation—it may be wholly erroneous—is that there is no country in this world where I have come in contact with men and women who have a higher sense of their obligations to the state than in Canada. You place imposts and taxes upon them, and ungrudgingly they pay them. At times of great national peril, when we must appeal to the accumulated wealth of the country to assist us in our difficulties, who perform those services for us? It is true they are paid for their services rendered, but who made possible the success of a great conversion loan in this country? Some men sneer and say it matters not, because they were paid for it. Well, the banks did this year's conversion loan for nothing, and they were glad to do it. These men are held up as feudal barons; we hear of their fastnesses, their

courts and the over-lordship they try to exercise over the people, but when I talk with them I am amazed to find that they are men with great human sympathies; whose contributions are the largest made; whose names, when their wealth permits—though in these days it does not—are at the head of every movement looking to the welfare of the people. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when a debate upon a tariff bill should not degenerate into an attack upon one's fellow Canadians, to make them the sport of rhetoric.

By reason of the office which I hold, during the last few weeks I have had occasion to come in contact with many of these men who are now called feudal lords and I can say to this house that I have seen no men so concerned as to their ability to maintain the integrity of their businesses in these times. They are concerned about their workmen. Someone sneers, but that is so. I know businesses in this country that are being maintained day after day running in the red; they are going behind, but the proprietors dare not, in the very nature of things, cease to carry on their operations because they will throw their employees out of work.

An hon. MEMBER: They are right.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course they are right, but why should we in this house now talk about them as requiring special privileges and becoming feudal lords? Why should it be said that this country is going back to the days of feudalism? I have asked it before: Who are these men? Captains of industry, you say; the president of a great power corporation, peradventure, or something of that sort. They were all right at one time; have they become all wrong now? They were excellent men and true a few short months ago; what has happened to them since? That is the question. I leave that thought with the house, because I feel that in these days no Canadian can afford to ask that his fellow Canadians have more than equal chances and fair opportunities, and if I thought this measure did not do something to bring that about it would not be submitted to this house. If I thought a shorter term of office would ensure a more efficient management of this board I would agree to it. I believe the measure can be improved to the extent of providing that they shall not all complete their term of office in the same year. In the United States that has been found an excellent idea. We have not followed that practice so much in this country, but to preserve continuity and stability of attitude of mind in approaching