

labour has in this country. It is all right perhaps to put an industry out of business. It is all right to go to that industry and say, "We are going to reduce the tariff and going perhaps to make it a little harder for you to carry on." Well, it might be said that affects the industry alone; but wherever industry is established we have a great many workmen, as for instance, in the riding I come from. I represent thousands of workmen who have become good Canadian citizens, men who have a stake in the country, who have, through their toil, built homes for themselves, bought real estate and property, and who

own a very large percentage of

12 m. the property in the constituency.

That is an investment which is too often lost sight of in dealing with public affairs.

These men are entitled to somewhat fairer treatment than they have received in the past, and if the government and its officials would pay more attention to this phase of the question and accord them a little more consideration when our policies are being framed there would be a good deal more satisfaction. In the riding which I represent a great many of the factories are idle, a great many of the looms are out of commission, and I know that dozens of men, whole families, entire connections—sisters, cousins and aunts—have all gone to the republic to the south, having sold their properties and left the work in which they have been engaged over here, in order to take up new positions in the United States. This is a distinct loss to the community, for these people were good Canadian citizens; and this is of course one of the conditions with which we are faced to-day. I do not say that the government can prevent this because there is a natural drift back and forth between the two countries. Personally, I believe that eventually a good many of these people will come back, but at the same time just at present it is a very considerable loss to Canada for our citizens to emigrate to the United States.

Mr. WHITE: Does the hon. gentleman think that a higher tariff would be of benefit?

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): I do not wish to enter into an argument on that question to-night.

Mr. SPENCE: You do believe it, though.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): I will tell my hon. friend some other time. I come now to the consideration of what I regard as one of the most important matters before the people of Canada to-day. I have no doubt that there is a great difference of opinion in this respect,

but it seems to me beyond question that there is a great demand throughout the province of Ontario for a better system than we have had in the past of securing the information which we require in order properly to formulate our tariff policy. There is, I say, an insistent demand all over the province in this regard; and I refer particularly now to the appointment of a permanent tariff commission. I do not say that the appointment of such a body would get rid of all our tariff troubles, but certainly it would afford the people and the government a means of obtaining some facts which I do not believe they possess at the present time. I firmly believe that a tariff commission would be of considerable advantage. In the year 1912 when Sir Robert Borden introduced the bill which at that time embodied a permanent tariff commission, that measure passed the House of Commons but was thrown out by the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS: Did it pass the House of Commons as brought down?

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): Yes.

Mr. HARRIS: I beg to correct the hon. gentleman; it did not.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): I have the bill here before me; it is No. 88 in the bills of the year 1911-12.

Mr. HARRIS: Let the hon. member read the amendments and he will find that this particular bill did not pass as brought down.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): I read the debates that took place at the time and I am not aware that very many amendments or any serious changes were introduced. I understand that the bill was passed by the House of Commons as submitted, but I may possibly be wrong in that respect.

Mr. HARRIS: It was passed with amendments.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): I may be wrong, but that was my understanding at any rate. However, the bill was thrown out by the Senate largely because there was no public demand for it. It was contended that the people had not asked for it, that nobody wanted it, and that it was merely a subterfuge on the part of the government of the day to evade responsibility in the framing of the tariff policy at that time. It seems to me that there is a good deal of misconception as to the functions of a commission of this kind. The other day in this House a question was asked by one hon. gentleman of another whether he considered the commis-