

son. Last year, for instance, we had a similar promise and nothing has thus far been done in the matter. I am afraid, with the big million-dollar organization of which I spoke at the beginning of my remarks, the Government will have a very hard time to convince its friends, the manufacturers, to make any reduction at all. The tariff is a pressing question in all parts of Canada. It is a question that the Government cannot put aside much longer, because if it is put aside by any party in power and that party refuses to deal with it, I am afraid that in the near future that party itself will be put aside. As regards the commission that is to investigate the different circumstances which might lead to new conditions when the tariff is revised, I have this suggestion to offer. It is all very well to have commissions go throughout the country and take opinions from different classes of the community as to what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. This has been done in the past, but I am afraid, with the different kinds of organizations and class movements there are to-day in this country, politics might creep into the affairs of this commission, and the good results which one would expect of such a commission might not be brought about. I would suggest that in years to come the best thing to do would be this. The Minister of Finance, whoever he may be in the future, would be surrounded by an advisory board, say of seven or nine persons, one of whom would be a manufacturer, another a farmer, another an economist and the others representative of the different classes of the community, who would, year in and year out, study the economic policies of the different countries of the world and who would at the proper time give the minister suggestions which they thought it proper for him to follow. Then, if the minister was a sound business man, like the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), or the hon. gentleman who preceded him (Sir Thomas White), or the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), who held the position of Minister of Finance in the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, this minister would be able to make good use of the information collected from different sources and would be able to give to Canada a progressive administration and a good tariff which would tend towards building up this country. In that event, we would not have, as we have to-day, a Budget that might be hurting certain individuals without striking at those who ought to pay more.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

The Minister of Finance stated that we ought to economise; that we ought to curtail expenditures on public works and to assist him in adjusting the finances of Canada. I am heartily in accord with what the minister has said, but I have this to point out to him. He should begin by himself setting an example to the people of this country. I would say to him as others who have preceded me, have said: Stop nationalizing the railways of this country; stop building a merchant marine; stop building a militia force and a navy in Canada; stop building the Hudson Bay railway and the Welland canal; stop expending money on the parliamentary secretaries we have to-day who do not do much work; stop the expenditure on the Board of Commerce, which has given us no results. I am astonished to find in the Estimates this year that it is proposed to vote the sum of \$324,000 for the maintenance and operation of the Board of Commerce, and \$26,000 for salaries. This is for the work the Board of Commerce is supposed to have done last year. Ever since this session began I have been asking for a statement of the investigations and prosecutions made by the Board of Commerce, but I have not yet received any statement. Ministers have told me that the statement would be forthcoming later, but no statement has come yet. As one hon. gentleman said yesterday, the only official statement we have had in connection with the board is that Judge Robson has resigned.

With respect to the Board of Commerce I might say that it was created last year in a very hurried manner to curb profiteering and reduce the high cost of living, but it seems to have achieved nothing along that line. Have we seen any really serious action brought by the board to make traders comply with the law? What has been done in that respect in other countries? I was reading a newspaper the other day which gives an account of what has been done in Paris. This is what it said:

French Profiteers Get Just Deserts.

Paris, March 13.—A few of the many profiteers are meeting their deserts. The manager for a wholesale dealer in butter and eggs was sentenced to a year's imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1,000 francs (\$200 normally). He had sold eggs for 715 and 710 francs a thousand instead of at the normal price, 695 francs. The wholesale dealer was fined 2,000 francs for complicity.

Other profiteers in foodstuffs have been imprisoned until their cases can come before the courts. Not only does the new law deal with profiteers in provisions, for a salesman at Chalon-sur-Saone has been sentenced to six