

*Tariff Board*

Then I find the following:

In the opinion of commissioners Dennis, Dixon and Clark the difference in costs of production shown above does not warrant a change in the duty.

We have here three high tariff commissioners finding as a matter of fact that the duty should be raised, and three low tariff commissioners finding as a matter of fact that the duty should remain as it is. Further data was submitted, and at page 181 the commissioners reiterate their decisions:

Commissioners Dennis, Dixon and Clark concluded that they "stand by their judgment as recorded in the original report that no warrant exists for a change in the present duty on corn".

To this judgment Commissioners Marvin, Brossard and Lowell issued a reply in which they proceeded to tear to pieces the conclusions of commissioners Dennis, Dixon and Clark to the effect that no warrant existed for a change in the present duty on corn.

I found this volume only a short time ago and have had it in my hand but a few minutes, but from a glance at the findings in connection with a few commodities I can see that to speak of this tribunal as being a fact finding body in the sense of mathematical precision is to make a statement much at variance with the facts. If the Prime Minister cherishes the hope that the tribunal he sets up will be able to find facts, in the sense we ordinarily understand such findings, I am afraid he is doomed to profound disappointment.

Mr. RINFRET: My hon. friend who has just spoken has failed to appreciate one fact, namely that the American commission is composed of three Democrats and three Republicans, whereas the proposed board in Canada would be composed of two Conservatives and one Tory. We may depend upon it that they will never split. They will seek out the facts with their own Conservative eyes and in perfect unison they will report to the government. The trouble with the American commission is that they were placed in the position where they had to receive both sides of a question. However my right hon. friend's board would not necessarily go into both sides; it would be a strong Conservative and

Tory commission representing the two sides, those of the Conservatives and the Tories. The two sides will always be in perfect accord.

A few moments ago my right hon. friend stated that tariff matters should not be left to guess work, but should be investigated. How is it, then, that we put through this house at the special session last year several hundred changes in tariff items, and are asked at the present session to put through about two hundred more? We have heard several long speeches in an attempt to convince the committee and perhaps the country—if the Prime Minister still cares any more for the country—that the necessity for this tariff board lies in the fact that there should be no guess work in matters of tariff. Yet without proper discussion and under conditions which made it imperative to pass the items at once, about four hundred items were put through this house at the last session, and there are about two hundred more to come before us within the next few days. Surely there is a lack of consistency. If no explanation can be made on this bill at least I think it should be made when we reach the tariff items in committee of ways and means.

I had another purpose in mind when I rose. The Prime Minister attempted to demonstrate to the committee that his board was to be judicial in character. I think my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition has presented a very strong argument to the effect that the tariff board should be merely advisory, and that in any event the government of the day should take the responsibility for the fiscal policy of the country. It may be of interest to point out the opinions in the country concerning this matter. I have only a couple of minutes at my disposal, but I wish to refer to an editorial which appeared in the *Montreal Star* of June 29—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton South): I must call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that it is now eleven o'clock.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.