

entirely and my right hon. friend seeks to make appointments for ten years of those whom he pleases, he creates in the minds of members on this side of the house and of the country generally the assumption that he has some objective that is not fully disclosed. In a word, he is seeking to create a board which will in some way fetter and bind those who may succeed him, should another administration follow his own.

We do not object to my right hon. friend choosing whom he wishes to advise him on facts pertaining to the policy on which he contends his administration has been returned. We do not object to his going to whatever lengths he may feel he is justified in going in paying these advisers whatever sums of money he thinks they should receive. We are not objecting to the annuity feature with respect to appointments. All that we are objecting to is his determination, despite every other consideration which may be given his appointees, that they shall be fastened definitely for a period of ten years upon the country, regardless of what changes may take place in conditions, regardless of how they may turn out as advisers, regardless of what changes may come in administration. If we are prepared to concede him the points I have indicated, he is deprived of nothing so long as he remains in office and administers the policies which he says he is there to administer. If the fiscal question should be, as it certainly will be, prominent in the discussions that take place in the next general election, and should my right hon. friend be returned to power, he will undoubtedly wish to retain his advisers; or if he should wish to change them, and our arrangement were carried into effect, he would be free to do so as his own needs might seem to warrant. But if there should be a change of administration my right hon. friend could hardly expect that a government which would be opposing his own party in a great political contest, as soon as they came into office and began to deal with the tariff, as they would be called upon to do if the tariff were the main feature, would be bound to continue in office and accept as their advisers those whom he had appointed to the board. It is so obviously unfair to contend anything else that my right hon. friend can hardly take exception to a statement which must be made very frankly at this time, namely, that if advisers do not enjoy the confidence of the administration of the day, nothing would justify that administration in continuing to ask parliament to

vote their salaries. All these things being considered, I think my right hon. friend could very well concede the one very reasonable change which we ask and which would alter materially our attitude toward the legislation as a whole.

May I say that I believe the feeling entertained against this bill in the form in which it is drafted arises primarily from this one section which seeks to bind subsequent administrations in the manner in which it does. The provisions of the bill go much further than the providing of a board which will be simply a fact finding board. If that were all this board had to do, I concede that there might not be the same reasons for objection. But my right hon. friend has told us that this tariff board which he is creating is in the nature of a new federal court. He is endowing that court with great powers, is making it a court of final decision with respect to the interpretation of the tariff, of orders in council, and of many matters which directly affect the administration of fiscal policy. He is giving these wide powers to the board and is also taking power to himself and his colleagues to substitute this board for the judiciary where the legislation of to-day provides that investigations may be held by judges of the supreme court, exchequer court or county court. To his administration he is taking the right to substitute this board for the persons named in the Combines Investigation Act for the purposes of investigation under its provisions. All of this being taken into consideration it arouses the suspicion in the minds of those who are inclined to be, I will not say critical but impartial, that there must be some motive other than that of simply creating a fact finding board. It is that suspicion which makes the opposition to this feature as strong as it is.

May I quote to my right hon. friend his own words on the question of principle. I mentioned these in part in speaking on the second reading. In replying, my right hon. friend did not make an answer to that portion of my remarks. Speaking in the house on April 24, 1928, as reported on page 2352 of Hansard, my right hon. friend said:

Five years is the life of a parliament, and I cannot think it quite consonant with the ideas of the right hon. gentleman as heretofore expressed that this parliament should bind the hands of future parliaments.

My right hon. friend was referring to annual expenditures, but this too, is a matter of annual expenditure; he is asking future parliaments to make an annual expenditure for a period of ten years to these particular