

tries so formidable as competitors is, that they can maintain high standards of living and efficiency at comparatively low cost in money.

In passing I may take this occasion to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross), concerning a definition given by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) of a political party. That was a very good definition and the attitude of the hon. member for Kingston towards it reminded me of some comments of Washington Irving on the same subject which seemed peculiarly applicable to the party to which my hon. friend belongs. Irving sagely remarks:

And here I would note the great benefit of party distinctions in saving the people at large the trouble of thinking. Hesiod divides mankind into three classes—those who think for themselves, those who think as others think, and those who do not think at all. The second class comprises the great mass of society; for most people require a set creed and a file-leader. Hence the origin of party: Which means a large body of people, some few of whom think, and all the rest talk. The former take the lead and discipline the latter; prescribing what they must say, what they must approve, what they must hoot at, whom they must support, but, above all, whom they must hate; for no one can be a right good partisan who is not a thorough-going hater.

Mr. WHITE: Does my hon. friend belong to a party?

Mr. BANCROFT: It is the popular rebellion against that kind of partyism, Mr. Speaker, which is responsible for the presence in this House of the large group to which I have the honour to belong. I may be pardoned for advising both the old parties to live up to the definition of the hon. member for Brome unless they wish to be left entirely behind in these days of independent and progressive thinking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to refer—

Mr. LADNER: May I ask the hon. gentleman if the prices he gave were in connection with duplex loaders or yarders?

Mr. BANCROFT: Yarders. I had the price of a two-speed yarder, a simplex yarder, and a duplex yarder.

Mr. LADNER: I think the House should be informed on a question of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LADNER: I should like to ask my hon. friend if he has certain information? I understood him to give the prices in Washington and British Columbia respectively.

Mr. BANCROFT: Seattle and Vancouver.

Mr. LADNER: I should like to ask my hon. friend if he has this information:

[Mr. Bancroft.]

Washington Iron Works 12 x 17—3 drum two-speed yarder.. . . .	\$11,500
Willamette Iron Works 12 x 14—3 drum two-speed yarder.. . . .	13,250
Vancouver built 12 x 14—4 drum simple geared yarder.. . . .	10,200

These prices are certified to by thirty-seven firms belonging to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. BANCROFT: I saw the list to which my hon. friend refers but the list I read was issued by the Logging Association of British Columbia. They repudiated the price list my hon. friend speaks of.

Mr. LADNER: I would ask my hon. friend if he has the loggers' price which includes the duty and freight to Vancouver? This information is necessary in order to make an intelligent comparison with the British Columbia price.

Mr. BANCROFT: I gave prices for the purpose of showing what the duty means to the logger in British Columbia, and to prove that full advantage is taken of the duty.

The passage a few days before the budget was introduced of a regulation abolishing the differential of 5 per cent in the valuation of imports under the dumping clause has given rise to doubt as to the reality of the tariff concessions in the budget. As a matter of fact if the dumping clause is applied to any considerable extent the real effect will be to neutralize the effect of the tariff reductions if not to actually raise the tariff.

The claim has been made on behalf of the Canadian manufacturers that the difference between the purchasing power of sterling and of the dollar gives the British manufacturer an advantage of about 2 per cent. The removal of the differential may therefore work in favour of the Canadian manufacturer to the extent of an additional two per cent or three per cent protection. Whether this is so or not will depend upon the extent to which the dumping regulations are applied. In any case the mere fact of the repeal of the 5 per cent differential just when strong representations were being made to the government that the tariff should not be materially interfered with, and just before the government seemed to have set its face in the direction of a low tariff, is of itself sufficient to arouse suspicions. The announcement by the hon. Minister of Customs that the old regulation creating this differential is to remain in force is in some degree reassuring. But there would appear to be nothing to prevent its being again suspended so soon as the budget is safely passed. Some more substantial assurances are required in a matter in which the minister seems to