

that the larger companies fail to compete with each other in certain goods. Thus the Dominion Textile Company, Limited, does not manufacture cotton denim, while other companies are the sole producers of other important lines. This means that the wholesaler, who wishes to carry a complete line of cottons, has to buy from all the larger companies.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is sufficient proof that lack of competition is partly responsible for the present distressed conditions in Canada, because these two industries to which I have referred are two of the highly protected industries in this country, and the report says there is little if any competition in them. They are two of the industries that are bleeding the people whom I represent in this house, probably to a greater extent than any other industries.

In view of what has been said with regard to the lack of competition I am at a loss to understand why a few days ago the leader of the C.C.F. group in this house, who spoke just before me, rather ridiculed the hon. member for Weyburn for his advocacy of what he called fair competition. Where there is unfair or what has been called imperfect competition—whatever that means—in these industries it has been shown that as a result the farmers are paying more for what they buy than they would pay if there was fair competition. As a result of the high tariff there is no competition, because the manufacturers of those goods in other countries cannot send in their goods to compete.

It is also shown in the report that the lowest wages are paid in some of the most highly protected industries. In view of that fact, and in view of the other matters revealed by the report, I do not think the bill now before the house goes far enough. I agree with the hon. member for East Kootenay (Mr. Stevens), who was a member of the committee when it was first appointed, that it is nothing less than anaemic legislation. If ever a board was necessary to devote its whole time to trade and industry, certainly it is necessary at this time. The bill proposes to give such control to a part-time board; that is, the tariff board will devote part of its time to this work.

Near the end of the session for 1933 a bill was introduced by the Prime Minister whereby he increased by \$3,000 the salary of the chairman of the tariff board, who was then receiving \$12,000. As a reason the Prime Minister stated that the position held by the chairman was a very important one and must be filled by a man of outstanding ability. Therefore he contended it was necessary that the chairman be given the additional salary. Some of

us opposed it at that time, and we still believe the increase was unnecessary.

My point is this. If in 1933 the position was so important that the chairman had to have an additional \$3,000, then I say it is too important to take on this extra work. He has not the time, and if he has the time then I say he has been paid entirely too much—and I have no doubt he has been paid too much, for a position such as the one he occupies. A board to control trade and industry would be much more important than a tariff board. The three members on the tariff board receive a total sum of \$35,000 in salaries. I contend that if we were to disband that board and appoint one consisting of seven members we could get that number of men for the same amount or less; we could get men conversant with the different angles of industry, and the chairman could remain here in the city of Ottawa. By all means however let us have a board competent to deal with these matters.

To me the findings of the committee and the legislation based thereon have been most disappointing. As long ago as November of 1932 I placed upon the order paper a resolution in these words:

That in the opinion of this house an immediate inquiry should be made under the provisions of the Research Council Act, chapter 177, R.S.C. 1927 or by other means, into the causes underlying the wide spread between the prices of raw products and the prices of goods manufactured from such products.

At the time I introduced the resolution I presented some specific cases wherein there were wide spreads between the prices of raw and manufactured products. Upon that occasion I made special reference to wool and leather goods, and like commodities. I was supported in the resolution by two or three of my colleagues, but I should like to draw attention to the fact that although the hon. member who preceded me is very much concerned to-day about what is being done under this legislation, I did not receive his support when on February 6, 1933, I introduced the resolution to which I have referred. As I recall the circumstances, during the discussion of that resolution one of the members of the C.C.F. group to which the hon. member belongs was in the house, and part of the time two members were here. Upon that occasion they were not concerned about the resolution, but now they pretend to be very much concerned about what is going to happen. When I introduced the resolution I called the attention of hon. members to the fact that while the price of wool was only about four cents per pound, a man wishing to buy a suit of woollen under-