

appointees, whoever they may be and however they may be performing their duties, and for all expenses in connection with the administration of this act. If he confines his ideas of principle to annual expenditures, then there can be no doubt on the score that he should not seek to bind this parliament beyond a period of five years. Binding the country with respect to annual expenditures may be bad enough, but to bind it with respect to additional powers to be conferred upon a body that is extraneous altogether to the administration of the day, is much worse. If it is a bad principle to bind an administration with respect to appropriations beyond the time of our parliament, how much more serious is it to seek to bind an administration with regard to powers being conferred upon some body which, once the enactment is passed, will exercise its authority and its powers for years, apart altogether from control by parliament? My right hon. friend went on to state in reference to myself:

I think the right hon. gentleman would be quite within the general constitutional practice if he said, "I desire that a given sum shall be available for this commission during the lifetime of the parliament over which I am the directing head."

May I apply the words of my right hon. friend to himself as regards this tariff board? They would then read:

I think the right hon. gentleman would be quite within the general constitutional practice if he said, "I desire that a given sum shall be available for this tariff board during the lifetime of the parliament over which I am the directing head."

May I continue with the remarks of my right hon. friend:

But when you ask parliament to bind its hands for thirty years I cannot help but think that is going too far, and that it is not quite consistent with the general principles under which we conduct our government.

That reference was to an appropriation being made for the maintenance of certain improvements in the driveway and parks system of the capital. It was not a matter of a difference of policy; there was no question of policy involved. Let me substitute his remarks and apply them to the present bill. They would read:

But when you ask parliament to bind its hands for ten years I cannot help but think that is going too far, and that it is not quite consistent with the general principles under which we conduct our government.

I quote also the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), who moved at that time an amendment similar to that moved with respect [Mr. Mackenzie King.]

to this bill. In moving that amendment the hon. member said:

My chief objection to the bill is that this parliament, through a commission, is making commitments for fifteen years.

In applying those words to the present measure they would read:

My chief objection to the bill is that this parliament, through a tariff board, is making commitments for ten years.

He continued:

which in the ordinary course of events will cover the lifetime of possibly three, if not four, parliaments. I think the principle is wrong, and I am surprised that it should be seriously proposed especially after what the Prime Minister said in this house when in opposition and since he became head of the government. To give to a commission the expenditure of moneys over a period of fifteen years is to my mind preposterous, and to take away from future parliaments the right to say how that money shall be spent, I think is also preposterous.

With slight changes those words could be applied to the present measure as follows:

To give to a tariff board the powers which are conferred by this statute over a period of ten years is to my mind preposterous, and to take away from future parliaments the right to say how those powers shall be exercised, I think is also preposterous.

I think hon. members will agree that that is a reasonable attitude to take in regard to legislation as far reaching and important as this present measure. May I return again to the remarks of my right hon. friend. Speaking on April 26, 1928, as reported at page 2399 of Hansard, he said:

Personally I have held a very strong view for some considerable time as to the undesirability of any legislature or parliament tying the hands of succeeding legislatures or parliaments with respect to annual expenditures.

The hands of this parliament are being tied for a period of ten years with respect to the annual expenses essential to the work of this board and for the payment of salaries in connection therewith. If my right hon. friend felt that way with regard to annual expenditures, how must he feel when a matter of policy is at stake? He gave his views in regard to policy as follows:

That idea may or may not be sound, but I do not think that when matters of policy are affected—and matters of policy always are affected in relation to grants of public moneys—this parliament should tie the hands of two or three succeeding parliaments.

Matters of policy are affected where grants of money are concerned but they are affected to an infinitely greater degree where the whole question is the controversial one of the tariff