

I understand my hon. friends on the left of the Speaker are contending for. Personally I cannot see the value of a board of that character.

Mr. ILSLEY: The words were "enjoy the confidence of the government."—not "be in sympathy" with it.

Mr. IRVINE: I would say in reply to that statement that if the proposed board measures up approximately to the status of a judicial body any other government will give its confidence to it. If on the other hand any other government might discover that this proposed body is not judicial, does not the act provide for the discharge of the individuals composing such a body?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CASGRAIN: No, it does not.

Mr. IRVINE: Well, then, why not make that provision?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is all we want to do.

Mr. IRVINE: Why not? If I am not mistaken I think I heard the Prime Minister say, when discussing this bill, that men would not be retained on the board if, as a judicial body, they were not rendering proper service. If the body created was acting not judicially, but was outstandingly partisan and was endeavouring to embarrass the existing administration, I would expect the government in power to do away with it. On the other hand I cannot see any use in the world of appointing a board to serve any particular government. To my mind such action would only involve unnecessary expense. If a government is doing what it likes anyway, no matter what a tariff board may find, why have such a body? That is the other side of the question.

On the other hand I do not wish to see any interference with the authority of parliament in respect to fiscal policies. We were assured last night by the Prime Minister that there was no such intention and that the proposed board would not operate in that way. If it does, surely it is time enough to object when the difficulty arises. I think we have the right to assume that in this connection the government is sincere in its efforts to secure a real fact finding body. I am assuming that, anyway; I must have confidence in whatever government may be in power. I would have as much confidence in statements made by the leader of the opposition, and I do not see why we should assume that every

statement by a government is absolutely sinister, inclined to be purely political and more or less false. From my experience in parliament and having listened to responsible men holding responsible positions I feel inclined to accept at face value the statement of the government's good intentions. In the bill now before us provision is made for the appointment of a board supposedly of a judicial nature. In this corner of the house we have always contended that since we are to have tariffs, no matter which government is in power, those tariffs, as nearly as possible, should be regulated in a scientific manner. Following that belief we have contended that some such body as the one now proposed should be appointed to find facts and enable each government in power to regulate its fiscal policy with due regard to the facts found. I do not say that the proposed body will find all the facts accurately on every occasion; I do not suppose any hon. member thinks that the board would be omniscient in judgment or knowledge, but I would think that a board which devoted its entire time to the study of all the facts entering into the framing of tariffs would be expected to know a little more about that subject and to have gathered a few more facts than an ordinary governmental body which deals with the many affairs of state. To my mind if such a body could get some of the facts accurately they would perhaps justify their existence. I think, as in every other body, very much would depend on the nature of the appointments, the personalities and capacities of the men appointed. Next in importance would be the extent to which the government would give serious thought to the facts found. As to the appointments, I believe there is no other way of ensuring a non-partisan body than to remove such a body entirely from the possibility of being discharged by the next government which might hold office. For that reason, if for no other, I would be in favour of the bill, believing as I do that there should be a judicial body and believing that facts should be found.

I do not know what my hon. friend to my right is giggling about, but if my reasoning is faulty I should like to know wherein the fault lies. If he giggles because of political suspicions, he may keep them to himself. I have tried to reason this matter out in the best way I know, just as my hon. friend has done. He takes exception to the bill because of certain suspicions he holds which I do not wish to share. The day may come when it may be proved that he was right; in fact I am not saying he is wrong. I merely state however