

bill now under consideration, it is not regarded as sound that one competitor should make known his cost of production, and so these costs thus taken from the books were treated by the tribunal as confidential. Just as sometimes in courts of law judges have permitted names to be written on a slip of paper rather than that they should be mentioned in open court, so when courts of law have had to deal with matters that appeared competitive between individual concerns, they have as a rule, unless fraud were charged, permitted that there should be a confidential relationship observed regarding the disclosures made by the producer on the one hand and the tribunal investigating on the others. Does not that seem reasonable? And all that is done by this measure is to provide that in a new country such as this, where the factor of efficiency must always be the primary and determining factor, and where efficiency and effectiveness must be the measure to determine whether or not an industry is being properly conducted; where that is so, it is not to be expected that you would make known to the world at large the low costs of an efficient concern as distinguished from the high costs of a poorly conducted concern. Just here may I add that my friend was entirely wrong when he suggested that we should put a premium on inefficiency. Far from it. The test both under this proposed bill and other similar legislation must ever be the highest form of efficiency in the country within which the test is proposed. I would agree with the hon. members for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) and Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) that if the test were the test of the least efficient industry it would put a premium on inefficiency. I have said frequently in public addresses throughout the country that never must the least efficient production be the test by which tariffs are determined; the most efficient production and the lowest cost must always be the determining factors of that branch of the inquiry. I still say that of no tribunal of which I can possibly think, least of all the tribunal to be set up under the provisions of this statute, will it be possible to say as has been suggested—and it is a proper suggestion, because if that were so it would be an unanswerable criticism—that the costs of the least efficient industry in the country should be the determining factor as to what the measure of tariff assistance should be. So after the matter is thus considered the conclusion is arrived at by the tribunal, and I desire to direct the attention of the house

to the simplicity of the conclusions. May I read them:

The commission finds it shown by the investigation (a) that the duty of 20 per cent ad valorem and 5 cents per pound expressly fixed by statute on edible gelatin valued at less than 40 cents per pound does not equalize the difference in the costs of production, including transportation and delivery to the principal market in the United States, of the said domestic article and the like or similar foreign article produced in the principal competing country; (b) that a decrease in the duty of 8 per cent ad valorem is necessary to equalize this difference; and (c) that the rates of duty necessary to equalize said difference are 12 per cent ad valorem and 5 cents per pound.

The commission makes no findings with respect to edible gelatin valued at 40 cents or more per pound.

Appended to this statement of findings is a summary of information obtained in the investigation.

Respectfully submitted.

That is signed by every member of the tariff board. Then follows the proclamation of the President of the United States, dated the 16th day of March of this year. The effect of that was to reduce by 8 per cent the ad valorem duty on edible gelatine valued at less than 40 cents a pound. That was brought about, not by advice, not by inferential conclusions, but by findings of facts made by a tribunal constituted for that purpose. If my hon. friends would take the trouble to read that short precis I believe there is not one of them who would not say: "It will be perfectly satisfactory if we can set up in this country such a tribunal, a tribunal that will ascertain the facts as presented to it at a public hearing,"—or as they call it, a conclusion. That conclusion resulted, as I have said, in a reduction of the duty. I have under my hand another case in which the finding resulted in an increase in duty, and another in which there was no change. But in every case they found as a fact that it was necessary there should be an increase or a decrease to equalize the cost of production between the domestic manufacturer and the chief competitor abroad.

Now, I submit to hon. members, could anything be fairer than that? I do think my hon. friends opposite have not in their minds the thought that we are honestly endeavouring to do something for this country that will enable us not to have a debate in parliament in which the leader of a great party will stand up and talk about many Canadians as the survivors of feudalism, creating a court for themselves as did the barons of old.