

on the same set of facts. This is a fact finding body with almost precisely the same powers as are to be given to the body created under this bill, and yet you find commissioners Marvin, Brossard and Lowell finding in favour of higher duties, and commissioners Dennis, Costigan and Dixon finding in favour of lower duties.

Mr. BENNETT: All these commissioners are out of office, if my memory serves me aright. It was the reorganized tribunal I was speaking of purposely, because it differs from the old.

Mr. ILSLEY: This was the United States tariff commission after thirteen years of office, and it was found that through the years the views of these gentlemen dictated the facts that they would find. That is the very argument that we are advancing. We are saying that the Prime Minister undoubtedly is going to select for this board friends of his party, men of his own views. He is going to put them in there and is going to ask them under his direction or at his request to find what duties will equalize the differences between the cost of production in Canada and in other countries. When they set out to find that they are going to run into insuperable difficulties. They are going to find that the cost in certain industries varies from province to province, from country to country, from state to state, and from year to year. They are not going to be able to find out what the cost of production is either here or abroad, and they are going to be faced with the necessity of telling the Prime Minister, if he is then the Minister of Finance, what rate of duty will equalize the difference in the cost of production, and the report which they will make is going to depend upon the views which they have held for years in the past.

I want to refer to a few specific instances in the year 1929. The United States tariff commission was directed to examine into the cost of production in the United States and abroad of logs of fir, spruce, cedar, or western hemlock. At page 123 of the thirteenth annual report of the United States tariff commission for 1929, which I have already cited, it appears that commissioners Marvin, Brossard and Lowell find that there was a considerable difference in the cost of production between the United States and Canada, and that a considerable increase in the then existing rate of duty would be required. Commissioner Dennis, Dixon and Costigan recommended to the president that a reduction was required

to equalize the difference in the costs of production. This is the mathematical precision with which the proposed board must operate.

At page 167 the tariff commission brought in a report on frozen eggs, and I would direct the attention of hon. members in the committee to this very significant paragraph:

Commissioner Dennis held that any conclusion drawn from the data gathered by the commission was largely inferential and conjectural, but doubtful—

I would ask hon. members to note these words—

—but doubtful as to whether exact costs could be calculated, he agreed to give the domestic producer the benefit of the doubt and joined the other commissioners in recommending a duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound.

If the proposed tariff board gives the domestic producer the benefit of the doubt, and makes rough, ready and haphazard recommendations as to the rates of duty, the tribunal would entirely lose its character as a fact finding tribunal. Indeed it would not be a fact finding tribunal in so far as it recommended increases or decreases of rates of duty. As I stated the other day it would be an opinion forming tribunal.

Then, at page 170 in this booklet the commodity under discussion was cream. Commissioner Dixon appended a statement to the report giving his reasons for withholding his signature. In other words, time after time as these various commodities came before them, these men were dissenting and coming to different conclusions on the same facts. At page 172 we find:

Vice-chairman Dennis and commissioners Dixon and Clark, in separate statements appended to the report, commented on several difficulties encountered in making cost comparisons.

All through this report we find that difficulties in coming to any definite conclusion as to costs were so great as to be practically insuperable. The report concerning corn as contained at pages 178 and 179 shows a clean split in the tribunal. I quote as follows:

Commissioners Marvin, Brossard and Lowell are of the opinion that the present duty of 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds prescribed in paragraph 724 of Title I of the tariff act of 1922 does not equalize the difference in costs of production in the United States and in said principal competing country;

Then at a later point I find the following:

The rate of duty necessary to equalize said difference in costs of production of corn in the United States and in said principal competing country, within the limit specified in section 315 of the tariff act of 1922, is a specific duty of  $22\frac{1}{2}$  cents per bushel of 56 pounds.