

I am quite content that this should be amended, because the meaning he attached to it is not the meaning I had in mind. I have no objection to the words "at the request of the minister" being substituted. The Minister of Finance is not directing the inquiry; he is requesting it.

The reason that we have so strong an opinion with respect to the tenure of office is because I entertain the belief, fortified by experience and observation, that if we are to get a board worthy of the name this provision must be made. In spite of what the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard has said against any board at all, most countries have found it essential in the conduct of government to depute to committees and commissions part of the work of ministries, and we believe that if we are to get the type of men essential they must not be appointed during pleasure.

I am not going over the ground again. You cannot pay a price which is out of line with the general salaries throughout the country. I have said, so frequently that it is hardly necessary for me to repeat it, that when we talk about abolishing appeals to the privy council we must never forget that the judges are paid \$8,000 a year, and you cannot get men to assume responsibilities in a court of last resort in Canada for a matter of \$12,000, \$14,000 or \$15,000 a year. If this commission is to be of the value I hope it may be, it must be composed of men possessing the highest qualities. As I explained to the house the other day, it is because I believe this may be of incalculable value to Canada that we have prepared this legislation in its present form. We believe that any salary short of this would not make the position attractive to anyone. The salary could be made larger, but then it would be out of line with other salaries, and the small annuity which is provided does not involve more than would be involved in the payment of a much larger salary, based on any table of life expectation which is in use to-day.

I can only say to the committee that here is a very earnest effort being made to provide this country with a body of men who will discharge the duties placed upon them to the best advantage to the country at large. With regard to the rhetorical references of the hon. gentleman to the empty cupboard and the skeleton I can only say that for years to come the skeletons he will find in that cupboard will not be Conservative skeletons, but he will find many Liberal skeletons that could well be taken out and clothed with flesh and blood. Some of them could be

destroyed, or a museum might be started; skeletons are very useful in that regard.

I cannot see my way clear to accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman, and no useful purpose would be served by going over the ground which already has been traversed with respect to this matter. If the threat of the Liberal party, as stated by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has the effect of depriving us of the services of the men we should like to obtain, the responsibility will not rest with us but with those who have made such a threat. It is not usual for threats of that kind to be made in parliament; it may be that this will have a very disastrous effect when we come to secure the people we should like to obtain, but I think not; I think perhaps, looking forward, they will see ahead ten years of useful service to their country with no chance of an opportunity being given the Liberal party to implement that threat.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope the Prime Minister will not feel that I am seeking unduly to delay the proceedings if I say but a few words to him by way of appeal for further consideration of this particular clause before he says finally it must pass in its present form.

May I say, as I always do in referring to the Prime Minister, that I believe he is quite sincere in the object he has in view, and when he says he thinks it would be easier to get the type of men required for a tariff board if the tenure of office be made ten years than if appointments are made at pleasure I am sure, he honestly believes that to be the case. If this were the only governing circumstance there would not be the same reason for objecting to the clause in its present form. But my right hon. friend is seeking at this time to bring in a very important measure, one far-reaching in its possible consequences, and which I say frankly I believe members on all sides of the house hope will serve a useful purpose, not only under one administration but under different administrations. It is from that point of view I am directing these few remarks to the Prime Minister.

I should like to see this legislation, as it appears now, of such a character that it would not need to be amended in the event of a change of administration, or should there not be such a change. In making appointments for ten years my right hon. friend is to a very considerable extent tying his own hands and those of his own party, and I shall be surprised if he does not come to regret the fact that he has been so insistent upon the