

board will be appointed under the terms of the proposed act, the terms of which however do not of necessity indicate that the board shall be of a partisan nature. Our experience in every phase of public life has been that other things being equal the long term board appointed for a term of years and free from political interference is more apt to be non-partisan than one which is appointed during pleasure. That is a likelihood. I am not going to summon as evidence such boards as the pensions board, the railway commission or other bodies of that nature. To my mind they have no relation whatever to the board now proposed. Those to which I have referred are administering acts which embody policies agreed upon by all sides of the house, policies about which no political contention has arisen to any large degree. They are administrative bodies putting into effect legislation and policies which have been agreed upon by successive parliaments and governments. Those bodies are not such as the one now under consideration.

I can see the danger with which the hon. member who moved the amendment was concerned, that of being saddled for ten years with a body which may be antagonistic to the views of a government which may come into power at a later time. I can see the possibility of a body which may be antagonistic in its nature, its outlook and its whole attitude towards the expressed viewpoint or expressed wish of the people. Certainly there is that danger. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if we are ever going to reach the time when we shall have a scientific tariff based upon honest facts we can only reach it by placing the tariff board beyond the reach of the influence of any government which may be in power at any time. Were it not for the statement I find in the preamble of the amendment, were it not for the fact that in supporting the amendment I should have to commit myself to a policy of which I do not approve, the philosophy—if we may use the term—that a tariff board should at all times reflect the changing fiscal views of changing governments, that it should bring to the performance of its task and to its inquiries minds already prejudiced and biased; were it not for that so-called preamble I would feel more kindly disposed towards the amendment. If the amendment sought to remove some of the obvious weaknesses I see in the bill, two of which I have touched upon, I should feel more kindly towards it. In the meantime I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that while I approve of the principle of the bill I cannot approve of many of the provisions therein contained. While I see the danger the mover

of the amendment had in his mind I certainly cannot become a party to the statement of policy outlined by him. All we can do in this house is, if possible, in committee, to modify and amend the bill. I must confess I do not approach that task in any sanguine spirit. I am fairly certain the bill will leave the committee much as it entered. We shall, however, do our best to effect those amendments. In the meantime we have heard the different points of view expressed and we have given the government something to think about. We have given the people of Canada some little idea of our attitude toward these matters, and in that regard we have performed the only duty which devolves upon us at the present time.

In conclusion, may I say that I have referred to the mandate of the present government, and I agree that the government has a mandate. Under the terms of its pledges and because of the majority by which it was elected and supported it has a right and a bounden duty to put into effect a higher tariff, of which I personally disapprove. May I add that I also have a mandate. The people of Red Deer constituency did not assist in putting the present government in power; they were not partners to the fiscal policy which is at present being put into effect. I was elected partly at least because of a protest against that policy, and I have voiced my protest in the house. Having so voiced my protest I have done my duty.

Mr. THOMAS McMILLAN (South Huron): I can assure this house, Mr. Speaker, that I have no intention of remaining silent during the discussion of a question such as this, fraught with such serious consequences to the welfare of Canada. Furthermore, I approach the discussion with the most gloomy forebodings. We can see at once that the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) and his followers have no intention of accepting the amendment to the bill which has been moved by the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley). Without the adoption of that amendment I am strongly opposed to the enactment of this bill.

Before presenting my reasons for such opposition I desire to say that in some respects I have a warm place in my heart for the Prime Minister. While at some times he has sought to dissuade me from saying what I wished to say, yet that seems to be a part of the game. I must thank him for the manner in which he always approaches me, and I shall never forget his meeting me on one occasion with the salute: "How long are you going to remain silent in this house?"