

been given to show that the public interest would be better served or more justice done to the people at large if such an investigation took place before this commission? Although this is a new jurisdiction, I say it is not an improvement, but rather a deterioration.

I am sorry that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) is not in his seat; I rather think he is the same ordinary Mr. Macdonald who expressed himself at that time on the subject. He is now Minister of National Defence. There is a whole page here which is not very complimentary to him if he rises in his place now and votes for the budget. I wish he were here, because I do not like to take advantage of an hon. member. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is here; he voted, but he did not have very much to say. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) comes from a part of Ontario that I am very well acquainted with. I wonder how he will vote on this proposition for a tariff board. Will he vote for the budget, or will he vote against it? I do not think he will vote against it—he may vote for his judgeship! The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Low) intimates that that is a little harsh; if it is, I will withdraw it. The hon. member for Welland—page 3581—said:

I am not in favour of a tariff board.

Bang, right off the bat he so expressed himself—"I am not in favour of a tariff board." I wonder how he will vote. Will he vote for a tariff board? I wonder if he would like to have a pair for that occasion? He continued:

I do not think that the commission should be allowed to hear evidence under oath, or any private conversation, that is not reported to parliament. Let those gentlemen who want to make their private suggestions to the Finance Minister make them, and let the Minister of Finance keep that information secret, as has been done in the past without any statutory provision to compel it to be done. But that this parliament should authorize a commission of gentlemen to inquire into the trade conditions of the country and to take evidence and report on that evidence to the Minister of Finance without making that evidence public, I think it wrong in principle, and will be detrimental to the interest of the country.

I am afraid he will have some qualms of conscience when he rises in his seat. We find the same hon. gentleman saying further on:

The objection to my mind is just this, and the fear is just this—that this commission is to be appointed with a view to increasing the protective tariff.

He objects so much to the protective tariff. I do not think the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) will have much objection to voting for that tariff board, because if I heard him aright yesterday he said that the government had some tariff for revenue principles

in mind, so I suppose "tariff for revenue" might be stretched this time to cover something in line with what the hon. member for Welland is objecting to—a protective tariff. Then again at page 5385 the same hon. gentleman (Mr. German) says:

The ministers can shield themselves behind the report of the tariff board who, they can plead, have gone throughout the country and made a full investigation.

Well, that is rather a good idea. It might be a good plea for some of the predicaments that the administration find themselves in. Then again I find the following from the same hon. gentleman:

I am afraid this is what they will do; and there is a very strong feeling in the country that this is what they will do.

I should like to point out that a motion was put to give this matter the six months' hoist. We find in favour of the motion, or practically voting against a tariff board, 52 yeas, among them being Marcil, Kyte, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Lovell, Murphy, Power, Robb, Pardee, Maclean, Macdonald, Lapointe, Clark (Red Deer), and His Honour the present Speaker; these were enrolled among those opposed to this tariff board. I expect to hear the Liberal statesmen of former days rise in their places and explain why they find themselves able at this time to vote for a tariff board when in 1912 they voted against a similar proposition which was promoted by the party of which I am a member, and which was eventually killed by the Liberal party. And that is not quite all either. The bill was finally killed, and the Liberal chieftain gloried in the fact that it was killed, for at page 6821 we find him saying:

I have something to say in conclusion to my hon. friend—I do not know whether the Senate will agree to the suggestion or not—but if as a consequence of the motion which is now before the House and which I suppose—and it is not a very violent supposition—will be passed by the majority sitting behind the Minister of Finance; if the result of this motion is that the bill is to be killed, I say to my hon. friend that it would not be an unmixed misfortune; on the contrary in my judgment, it would be an unmixed blessing.

I venture the opinion that when the government brought down this proposition they were perhaps hoping against hope that in like manner as a similar proposition was killed in 1912 it might be again killed, as every bit of legislation that has been brought down by this administration has been killed. For instance, the Great Lakes inquiry, the present ocean freight rates inquiry, the wheat pool—all these infants born to the administration, some prematurely and some carried