

doing justice to the board and will not contribute to the effectiveness or efficiency of the board.

Mr. GOOD: Is it the minister's plan or suggestion that this board should be employed continuously, or that they should be employed for stated periods only?

Mr. BUREAU: As long as they are efficient, and their services are required. There is not in the bill that will be presented to the House any limit of time.

Mr. GOOD: They are to give their full time to the work?

Mr. BUREAU: Absolutely.

Mr. MANION: Will this board be something akin to the Advisory Tariff Commission of the United States?

Mr. BUREAU: They will receive instruction and will act under the directions of the Governor General in Council, and will have all the necessary powers given to them. These matters can be discussed in committee. It is the intention to get the best men available, men with a knowledge of taxation, who can suggest or advise, and they themselves may suggest what they think they ought properly to do, subject always to the regulations of the Governor in Council. That will be in the bill.

Mr. MANION: Has the government decided as to the personnel of the board, assuming that the bill goes through? Have they decided as to the qualifications necessary for the personnel? For example, have they decided that they might have one manufacturer, one farmer and one labour man appointed? Perhaps the minister will say that they have not decided on the personnel.

Mr. BUREAU: I have no one in sight, and my colleagues have not suggested anyone. We want men with the proper qualifications and whether a man is a manufacturer, a farmer, a Grit, a Tory or Progressive, will not weigh in the balance at all. My hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) may laugh. Of course, we are always apt to measure others by our own yardstick; but that is my intention, and I am going to carry it out. Produce the man, and if he is qualified he will get the position.

Mr. MANION: The reason I ask is that in 1912 a resolution was brought into the House, I think by one of the late finance ministers.

Mr. BUREAU: Sir Thomas White. That was the tariff board.

[Mr. Bureau]

Mr. MANION: Yes. My hon. friend is not guilty in that matter. The resolution was passed by this House and turned down in the Upper Chamber.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. MANION: Personally I have on two or three occasions in speeches on the budget supported the idea of an advisory tariff commission to thoroughly look into the tariff question with regard to each individual industry, and to advise the government; but since that time I have been told by some of those who supported the appointment of the board that later they changed their minds on the ground that when this board was suggested, there was a demand from so many different classes of people, urging that they be represented on the board, that it was thought the board would become practically useless. They said that the farmers and the manufacturers and the labour people all claimed that they must have a representative. So that, instead of having members appointed who would thoroughly go into the tariff question, or who are capable and able from their natural ability to go into the whole matter, they were requested to appoint a class board, if I might use that term. That is why I asked as to class representation on that board. If it be finally decided by the House that the board should be appointed and the government finally appoint a board, I think the best men from the standpoint of knowledge should be appointed, if possible. We require not only men who have had political training—that might even be forgotten—but we want men who have had training in tariff matters and questions of taxation.

Mr. BUREAU: Generally such men have no strong political leanings.

Mr. MANION: I agree with that. I think that if the appointments are finally made, these appointments should be based more on the ability of the men than on any consideration of their political leanings or of their class.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, solely and absolutely.

Mr. GOOD: If this board is to become a board to sit in judgment upon the claims of various industrial classes for special privileges, I think they will soon get lost in a hopeless morass. I would be very much opposed to any board that would confine itself largely to the consideration of such matters. I do not think it is the intention of the government to constitute a board of that kind. Incidentally I suppose they might consider the