

of getting evidence which would justify them in raising their own tariff. I cannot think of a single instance, except maple products in which, when they returned to their own country, they did not increase the tariff on the particular article with respect to which they had come over to make inquiries.

No one suspects this government, surely, of any intention of appointing such a board. Oh, no. But they might. How will they obtain the facts in another country? Over and over again, the difficulties involved have been pointed out. What kind of board will be chosen? We can only surmise by what has been done recently. We know some of the representatives the government put on the Stamp commission. We know that Sanford Evans was put there, and he delivered the goods very well on behalf of the cause he represented. If that is to be taken as an indication of the kind of board we are to get, we shall have to look elsewhere for that judicial body which the Prime Minister has so glowingly described. This trio which is to constitute the tariff board is to be a sort of glorified board of judges, only of a very much higher type: they would not have any political ideas or bias in their minds; they are to be totally impartial; they are to give their decisions quite regardless of the views or the wishes of the government. Can you imagine such a condition of things? Are we ready for glory, Mr. Chairman? Have we arrived at the millennium? We do not expect that of this government, at least, and we know that we shall not get such a tariff board from them—a body which is supposed to come to conclusions on data and figures that are so problematical in character and which are next to impossible to acquire in a foreign country.

I have no hesitation, in the circumstances, in voting emphatically for the amendment. This is one of those things regarding which you might very well say that the more you think of it the less you think of it; and if we keep on discussing it much longer the government, I fancy, is almost prepared to throw up its hands and discard this phase of the bill, the ten year board appointment.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Holding the fiscal views I do, I should prefer a board appointed at pleasure and not for a period of ten years as the Prime Minister is determined to appoint them. The Prime Minister might accept the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Justice. The board should be appointed either by a non-partisan committee of the house, or else it should be approved by the house before the actual appointment is made. Only in that way can we ensure that the personnel will be all and will do all

that the Prime Minister intends. I agree with the last speaker, that it is stretching credulity too far to ask anyone in this house to believe that hon. members opposite, elected as they have been on a high tariff policy, will appoint anything else than a board whose sympathies will be all in the direction of high tariffs. The little red herring of fact finding which has been drawn across the trail is just so much fog to obscure the real purpose of the board.

Let us consider for a moment the finding of facts in connection with an industry in Canada, not to mention one outside. What factors will be taken into consideration in the ascertaining of facts? Will watered stock be considered, will that be one of the factors to be investigated? Will the earnings of the company be considered, the efficiency or otherwise of its management? Who will determine what is or is not efficiency in management? What about the factories in eastern Canada whose equipment is out of date? Many of those factories will attempt to operate for purposes of internal economy, no doubt mistaken, under a high protective policy which permits them either to peg prices or actually to increase prices. What about the location of factories? Is that not a factor to be considered in investigating costs? What about available markets or the possibility of the expansion of markets? I find it impossible to imagine that any board could determine what the facts are without a formula previously being prescribed. Even if a formula is prescribed, the facts themselves may in turn become mere doubts.

The work of a tariff board of this kind may be most important, but following the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Waterloo, it seems to me to be the height of absurdity for the Prime Minister to come forward with a proposal to establish a judicial tariff board to ascertain facts and to find out whether or not the tariff should be raised after he has mutilated the tariff schedules of this country. If the administration were sincere before raising one single item in the tariff, they would first reduce them to the former level and then submit them to this proposed fact-finding tariff board. However, I do not think there is the slightest intention on the part of the administration to do that sort of thing.

Another phase of this bill to which I take serious exception is the secrecy clause. I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in his contention that any industry, any manufacturer or any interest of any kind, whether it be agricultural or otherwise, applying to the government for special privileges of