

would urge that it be done during the present session of parliament and not leave it to the tender mercies of the customs board, because in that case it might never be considered.

There is one sentence in the budget speech of the Minister of Finance which I view with grave concern. It is as follows:

Resolutions will be submitted for your approval empowering the governor in council, when satisfied that copper bars are being sold in the country of export at a lower price than for export to Canada, to impose, under the general tariff, a duty on copper rods of one-half cent a pound, to equalize such differential as may exist.

I am opposed to the granting of that power to the ministry. In the first place, it is not economically sound; and in the second place, it is subversive of the powers of parliament. A peculiar situation exists with regard to copper. Ninety-five per cent of the world's copper is controlled by the United States; it is not all mined there, but it is controlled from that source. The only smelter of any size outside of that American ring is the smelter at Trail, British Columbia. This small ring of men who control the copper situation in the United States have formed what they call the Copper Export Association. They would like to fix the price for copper for all the countries in the world, but when they attempt to fix the price for the United States they run foul of the Sherman anti-trust law. But the American government permits them to fix the price for export, and after they have fixed the price for export each member goes back to his own factory and quietly quotes an American price of half a cent per pound below the export price. It is a very simple arrangement, but how it would stand investigation in the United States, I do not know. Since they fix the price at half a cent per pound higher for export than for domestic consumption, the Canadian who has to buy copper bars is forced to pay half a cent per pound more than do his American competitors. There is a small concern at Brockville, Ontario, which makes a business of manufacturing copper rods out of copper bars. They obtain 60 per cent of their copper bars from the smelter at Trail—that is all they can get there—and the other 40 per cent they have to buy in the United States, and for that they are forced to pay \$8 to \$10 per ton more than do their American competitors. When they go out to sell their product they find themselves faced with the competition of American firms who have bought their bars at a lower price, and the proposal is that we give to the governor in council the power to put a duty of half a cent per pound on copper rods so that this

Brockville company will not be subject to this unfair competition. The obvious answer to the American Copper Export Association has been made by Noranda mines, who have decided to build a smelter of their own. But that cannot be done for some time, and the question is: What will we do in the meantime? This concern at Brockville employs about thirty-one men and, as I said, they obtain 60 per cent of their copper from Trail and 40 per cent, which is subject to this extra price, from the United States. The proposal is to add a half cent per pound to all rods coming into Canada in order to protect this industry which employs only thirty-one men and obtains only 40 per cent of its raw material from the United States. In order to offset a handicap of \$8 a ton on 40 per cent of the raw material of 31 men it would add \$10 a ton to the price of the raw material of several Canadian factories that use copper rods as raw material. It would increase the price on 100 per cent of the raw material used by other factories in Canada which employ many times 31 men. You cannot put that duty on without increasing to every factory the price of their raw material, and in that way it is economically unsound.

But the worst feature of the proposal is that it is subversive of the powers of parliament, Parliament has been maintained by the British people throughout the ages for one purpose above all others; to restrain the power of the king or of the government of the day. If we never do anything else but hold the ministry back from usurping powers which do not belong to them, we justify our existence; if we fail to do that we cannot justify our existence. It may be said that the ministry is honest and we can trust them, but these gentlemen will not always be in office.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The matter of restricting the powers of government is a very vital one, and I agree with the hon. member in that regard, but is he prepared to vote against a government that proposes this?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): The hon. member will get his answer in due course.

Parliament has always been maintained for the purpose of preserving the rights of the people against encroachments by the crown. The ministry might be entrusted with this power and not abuse it, but we must not forget that it was always during the reigns of good kings that the people lost their liberties. They said, "The king is good, the king is wise and he may be trusted with this power." They gave him the power and he used it with wisdom and with mercy. But in time another king sat on the throne