

Paragraph (b) provides that those guilty of illegal practices shall be disqualified for a period of five years next after the date of being so found, convicted, ordered or found guilty.

Now I come to the bill constituting the tariff board in which the Prime Minister inserts a clause making every member of it non-eligible as a candidate for election to this house for a period of two years after he has ceased to be a member of the board. Is that provisions inserted, as was pointed out so ably by the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilesley) when he moved his amendment to the second reading, because the Prime Minister is afraid that these men will be guilty of corrupt or illegal practices. Is that the reason? He places the members of the board in exactly the same class with those who are found guilty of corrupt or illegal practices. I think that all members of the house will see at once the absurdity of such a provision. Surely, Mr. Chairman, after a man has served his country faithfully and well, on the tariff board, especially if he is of the calibre that has been suggested to this house, and if the people of any constituency desire him to represent them in this house, he is entitled to be a candidate. I would think he would be all the more fitted to be a member of this house because of the training he would have had as a member of the board. I do not propose to speak longer on the subject. I hope that the Prime Minister will see the force of my argument. When one searches, and I have searched diligently, to find some reason why this provision should have been inserted in the tariff bill, one can only come to the conclusion that it was done through some personal antipathy on the part of the right hon. the Prime Minister. I sincerely hope he will not allow personalities to enter in, and that he will permit this section to be withdrawn. I move, Mr. Chairman, that section 3 be amended by striking out subsection 7 thereof.

Mr. EULER: I may have missed the explanation of this subsection. I would ask the Prime Minister for what reason this clause is inserted.

Mr. BENNETT: For the reasons stated in the subsection.

The CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment will say "Aye".

Mr. RINFRET: I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we should rest satisfied with the Prime Minister's reply. We asked what

[Mr. Gray.]

was the reason for a particular subsection being in the bill, and the Prime Minister replied, "for the reasons stated in the subsection."

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The question has been put, and the hon. member can only speak with the consent of the house. The hon. member was a little late in rising.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the Prime Minister not give his consent?

Mr. BENNETT: It is not a question of the Prime Minister. The rules of order are not in the hands of the Prime Minister.

Mr. RINFRET: Then I will speak afterwards unless the house consents.

The CHAIRMAN: If the committee consents, the hon. member may speak now.

Mr. RINFRET: When an hon. member asks the Prime Minister the reason for a certain subsection being in the bill and the Prime Minister replies, it is because the subsection is there, well, I do not want to use strong terms, but I do feel that the Prime Minister's disregard for the house has got to a point where it certainly should be reprimanded. The objection that has been made by the hon. member for West Lambton is very strong. He has shown conclusively that there are three classes of men who are going to be disqualified from being candidates in an election; those who have been guilty of corrupt practices are disqualified for seven years; those who have committed illegal practices are disqualified for five years; and those who have been members of this tariff board are going to be disqualified for two years. Surely a reason should be given for doing that. I insist that before we take the vote on the amendment the Prime Minister refrain for a few moments from writing the letter he is now writing and stand up and give us an explanation. With all respect I do say that I realize that the Prime Minister is working very hard. His capacity for work is stupendous, but he has imposed upon himself this quantity of work. We are not responsible for that. We have urged him repeatedly to appoint a Minister of Finance and to let his ministers be other things than small messengers around him. We have urged him to give them a chance to take their stand in this house. Surely when a question is put to the Prime Minister in the manner in which my hon. friend from North Waterloo put his question, and when an amendment is