

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It is possible. However, as my honourable friend states, this legislation has been honoured rather in the breach than in the observance, because since the Act was passed various holidays have been claimed—rather, they have been enjoyed without any special proclamation. It will be for the Commons to examine their conscience and see how they can square themselves with that which has just been read.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: I refer not so much to the House of Commons as to the Government, who have declared this day a holiday in the Civil Service. So far as the House of Commons are concerned, I admit that they have a perfect right to declare a holiday for themselves whenever they like. I submit, however, that the Government of the day have no right to override the statute as they are doing.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from yesterday consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech on the opening of the Session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Pardee for an Address in reply thereto.

Hon. R. DANDURAND: Honourable gentlemen, when the Senate adjourned last evening I was speaking of the inexplicable and unjustifiable attitude of the manufacturers in 1911. I feel that they then disqualified themselves to teach goodwill and fair play to the farmers of this country. Their attitude and action in 1911 preclude them from judging others on that score. The farmers will never be able to equal them in the field of selfishness.

In the midst of these conflicting interests stands Parliament as the supreme arbiter. We have to lay down a just and fair policy in the interests of the whole of Canada. What is the present grievance of the manufacturers? I stated that the farmers at large were asking for a reduction in the tariff and the manufacturers were now being heard in their demand for an increase in the tariff. What is the present grievance of the manufacturers? It is the increased preference to Great Britain. I desire to lay down the principle that the Canadian tariff is made for Canada's benefit alone, and that the preference to Great Britain has been given for our sole advantage. In this rigorous country we must see to it that the people are properly clad at a minimum of cost. The tariff must be so arranged as to ensure a fair price to the consumer as well as

to the producer. Where can we draw the line? It is a difficult problem indeed. There are great variations in conditions both periodical and geographical. The costs of materials vary. Commercial depressions occur inside and beyond our borders. There are the fluctuations in exchange; there are the differences in wages. Consideration must also be given to the domestic market and its limitations, to the foreign market and the possibility of our manufacturers competing, and what not. All kinds of conditions may intervene to vary the situation. The conditions under which a tariff is fixed to-day will not be the conditions of to-morrow. I am of opinion that a certain inflow from outside is a sure indication and guarantee of fair conditions in the country. It makes for healthy competition; it keeps the manufacturer on the alert and develops his spirit of initiative.

What should be the imposition, tax, duty or protection? All these words are synonymous. The manufacturers have two main grievances against the British preference. They point to woolens and to footwear. Let us take woolens. Men's clothing and overcoating, tweeds, cassimeres, doeskins, and other cloths appeared to be affected by the tariff. The preferential tariff levied was 27½ per cent, the intermediate 35 per cent, the general 35 per cent. There has been a reduction of ten per cent in the duty on British goods imported through Canadian ports, which brings the duty down to 24½ per cent. There was in 1923, it is true, an increase in importations of woolen goods over those of 1922; but was that increase due to this increase in the preference? I doubt it very much, and I think the figures which I will quote will disprove it. In 1921 the total importations into Canada of manufactures of wool were \$61,928,975; in 1922 they were cut practically in half, being \$32,048,615; in 1923 they came up to \$40,655,452. Honourable gentlemen will notice that even with that increase in 1923 the importations were less than they were in 1921 by one-third.

Now, is the increase in importations in 1923 over 1922 due to the preference? I have a statement giving the importations per month of dutiable woolen goods from Great Britain in 1922 and in 1923. What does it show? The first preference came into effect in May, 1922, and could only affect the entries after June, 1922. The figures for the first five months, before the preference, were as follows: January, \$2,173,298; February, \$2,295,000; March, \$3,494,000; April, \$1,682,000; May, \$2,834,000. And now come the months after the preference; June, \$2,197,000; July, \$2,155,000; August, \$3,028,000; September, \$2,-