

I am told, by the change that was made in the tariff. When the manufacturers know the great change that is made and what it will mean to them, they will not be pleased. It will mean throwing out of employment hundreds of Canadian labourers, and sending our money to feed labourers in England and Germany, and other countries who are manufacturing goods for us. We as Canadians do not want that to be done. We want to give employment to labour at home, we want the labourers of our country to live and to keep their families alive in comfort. We want to give them fair wages, we want their wages to be spent in this country; therefore I say that if goods come in under that new schedule it is going to affect injuriously the manufacturers of this country. But we were told by the Finance Minister the other night that they have no right to expect very much from him, because he said that they got the benefits of the tariff while it was in force. He thinks these people have no right to look unpleasant, but that they must bear the consequences. Well, that is not a very agreeable thing to tell a man when he is losing his means of living, when he is losing the money that he has invested in manufactures. Therefore, I do not think that he will be very liable to praise the Government for the new tariff that they have given. I stand squarely upon the question of protection, as I have always stood. I believe it is the policy for Canada; I believe that the interests of Canada demand it as much to-day as it ever did, and I believe we will require it in the future. I am to-day unalterably on that platform, and I will remain there. So far as this tariff makes no changes in the old tariff I have little complaint to make, but in regard to the favoured-nation clause I take strong exception to it.

Finally, I will deal with two questions involved in these resolutions. There are two vicious and unsound principles in these tariff resolutions. The first is the granting of power to the Controller of Customs, subject to the Governor in Council, to say what countries shall have the advantage of the favoured-nation schedule. What does that mean? It means placing vast powers in the hands of the Controller of Customs. To my mind, it practically places in the hands of the Controller, subject to the Governor in Council, the right to make treaties. We do not, in this tariff, specify that if a certain duty is imposed on certain specified articles, and the country from which they come take off or reduce the duty on similar articles of ours going to their country, then we will make concessions to them as was the case with our offer of 1879 to the United States. We then provided that when the United States gave us the freedom of their market for certain articles, then we would give reciprocity in the articles affected. That was definite and specific, but this is neither de-

finite nor specific. The British Parliament has never placed this power in the hands of the Governor in Council there. England has never given us the power to make treaties, which have to be made through England; but this Government is giving the Controller of Customs, governed by the action of the Governor in Council, the right to make treaties. He will consider whether Germany should come under the favoured-nation clause. He will say to that country: if you lower your duty to a certain extent, we will let you come in under the new tariff; if not, we will refuse you the benefit of the preferential clause. This action is not subject to the review of Parliament, but the Controller of Customs will have the power to take action, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; in other words, the Governor in Council will have the right to make treaties with other countries, if my interpretation be correct. I hold it is correct. This I contend is a vicious and unsound principle; there is precedent for it; it is another leap in the dark, and it is a proposition which should not be allowed to pass this House.

The other vicious principle is that involved in the power given to the Governor in Council to say what articles are under combines, and what reductions should be made in the duty on the same class of articles coming from abroad, or whether the duties should be taken off absolutely. What does this involve? It says to every manufacturer that if you make any arrangement to raise the price, the Government can call you to account; they can bring you before them, and if on examination it is found that you have arranged your business or output with others in the same line so that the price is increased an Order in Council can be passed lowering the duty or placing said articles on the free list. That is taken from an American Act, which I remember reading a few years ago, but it involves a principle which has never been acknowledged here. It places in the power of the Governor in Council control over the manufacturers of the country, a power which might be used in the spirit of blackmail. They might bring manufacturers here and inform them that they had their line of business under review, and if they did not support the party pretty well, they would change the duty, but if they made peace with the Government, it would be all right. Parliament should not place in the hands of the Governor General in Council that power, for it would lead to evil most assuredly. Admitting that hon. gentlemen opposite might exercise this power properly, honourably and honestly, all governments might not so act, and perhaps the Government of the party with which I am connected might not act properly, and therefore I hold this power should not be conferred on any Administration. In that respect the tariff resolutions are entirely wrong, and this principle should