

the legislation shortly to come before us, which is really a corollary to this legislation in reference to dumping.

The ramifications of this legislation are so extensive that no person who has not had experience in the importing business can fully realize what it means. In the first place, I would point out that the tariff is a matter for experts. I may say that for twenty-five years I have followed the tariff very closely. I happened to be the president of a wholesale concern that did a business of half a million dollars a year, and as such had too many unhappy experiences with the customs regulations and the tariff to be entirely ignorant of the subject. I have made trips to the Old Country to satisfy myself of certain conditions in order that I might be better prepared to come before the Minister of Customs or his deputy and show that from time to time the importers were penalized, and that the consumers had suffered in consequence. In many cases I was successful. More than fifteen years ago, when Mr. Patterson was Minister of Customs, and Mr. McDougald was his deputy, a question came up in regard to the importation of wire netting, which was one of our main articles of importation. I may say that in the course of business we hardly ever had two successive invoices without post entries being made, and all sorts of technicalities being raised in regard to the rate of duty and dumping. I remember one particular shipment that came, and that the customs officials refused to pass. I came to Ottawa, and after some difficulty secured an interview with the Minister. I was told that the Department was not legislative, but administrative, and that changes could not be made by the Customs Department. I said that if they were necessary we would have the matter taken up by our member and threshed out on the floor of the House. My firm was in a position to place \$100,000 worth of wire netting. I had letters in my possession from all the wire netting manufacturers in Canada stating that they could not manufacture anything stronger than 16-gauge netting, and that they did not galvanize the netting after it was woven. At last, after two or three days of argument, the Department admitted that my contention was correct. As a consequence we saved some thousands of dollars on the shipment, and the consumer got the benefit.

The fact is that the manufacturers of this country are exploiting the consumers. The tariff is full of anomalies. I will take second place to no man in this Chamber or in the House of Commons on tariff matters. I say

that in all humility. I have made a study of the tariff, and understand it perfectly as far as the items are concerned.

Wire netting is a commodity largely used in Prince Edward Island, and a large amount of money, probably over \$500,000 a year, is involved in its importation. We have repeatedly asked the Canadian manufacturers to instal galvanizing vats to galvanize the netting after it is woven. The netting manufactured in Canada is galvanized by what they call the rubbing process, a powder process that takes place before it is woven. We asked them if they would put in galvanizing vats if they were assured of a certain amount of business. They said that they would not; that they would not galvanize the netting after it was woven, and that they could furnish nothing heavier than 16-gauge. That is only one among scores of experiences.

Another article not manufactured in Canada is the power-driven bone-crusher. But because there is a simple affair that is used in kitchens and comes under the same classification, these bone-crushers are subject to a certain duty. These are just a few instances of the difficulties that we encounter.

It has been said in another place that assurances have been given by the manufacturers that the consumer will not suffer by reason of the increased protection. In view of the fact that not only in Canada, but the world over, there is a tendency towards a reduction of prices, perhaps we can accept that statement. The manufacturers, who are well looked after, can go so far without any material disadvantage to themselves, but I know that in some instances such an assurance has not been given and is not going to be given. But does not the consumer suffer by reason of this added protection? But for it he would be able to get the necessities of life at a lower price, as consumers in other countries are doing. This lower price condition is world wide; and the consumer in this country is bound to suffer by reason of this change in the tariff.

A matter that enters largely into the cost of production is overhead. Overhead is, to use a slang phrase, very easily "padded." Is there going to be any investigation into the details of operating cost—salaries, automobiles, trucks and things of that kind that go into the overhead of the manufacturers? Overhead is something that can very easily be expanded, thus making profits look very reasonable when, as a matter of fact, they are quite the contrary.

The whole tendency of this legislation is to curtail sales, stifle enterprise, and make