

not be in the interest of the farmers. There is no doubt that the Government will find that the specific duty is the proper duty. They have adopted it in some cases, for example on coal and sugar; but why not have a specific duty on everything? I suggest to the Government even now that if they impose only a small specific duty, that would be a check on the ad valorem duty, and they would be able to collect the revenue. Another matter I wish to call attention to is the effect of the tariff on the wage-earner. I wish to say that if our industries are to be continued running, this new tariff will mean, at the start, a reduction in the wages of the employees of from 15 to 20 per cent. You are very well aware that in the last six months, some fifteen or twenty mills have failed, and commerce has been in a bad condition from one end of the country to the other. And now the Government has struck a blow which will have the effect of closing down many industries. The smaller mills in all parts of the country will have to close, and if this preferential clause is carried into effect, it is only a question of a very short time when the large ones will follow suit.

As regards this double-barrelled tariff which we never had before, and which is styled the preferential tariff, it will have the effect of closing down a large number of manufacturing industries owing to the competition it will create from England. We have had several speakers on both sides expressing themselves in favour of the preferential clause, but for my part, I say that duties should be collected equally from all goods, no matter from what country they may come, whether England, Belgium or Germany. We are bound to protect the wage-earners of this country but by this clause the Government have inflicted a very cruel blow on them. Take for instance the lock manufactories, which, under the old tariff, were protected by a duty of 32½ per cent, but which duty is now reduced to 30 per cent. It is true that the Government have lowered the duty on raw material, but that is a very small element in the matter, and that industry will have very hard work to exist if it be not wiped out.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Nothing of the kind.

Mr. KENDRY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that he does not know everything. In the town where I live, we have a large lock manufactory, and the gentlemen connected with it know something about their own business, and they will corroborate what I say.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The lock manufactory in our town is perfectly satisfied with the tariff.

Mr. KENDRY. I think the hon. gentleman would be satisfied with anything so long as it comes from that side of the House.

I now come to the carpet industry which has been encouraged under the National Policy, and which is another one that will be wiped out. The hon. gentleman will find that, from one end of the country to the other, unless the tariff is changed, a great number of these manufactories will be wiped out. Hon. gentlemen opposite are sending their emissaries to all parts of the world to induce immigrants to come to this country at the same time that he proposes allowing thousands of wage earners to come into this country to the United States. I hope that is a policy which will not be adhered to by hon. gentlemen opposite, but that they will become convinced by the deputations that are waiting on them from day to day and by the appeal all over the country that these grievances are very serious.

I wish now to refer, before closing, to a clause in the report of the Controller of Customs, which provides:—

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

If that is going to be carried out, it is certainly something which would not be carried out except by this Parliament. It is something unprecedented to give such a power to the Controller of Customs. I remember some years ago a measure somewhat similar was introduced into the United States House of Representatives and they threw it out. It seems to me that the same course should be followed here. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press that part of the resolution. I do not wish to say anything further on the matter except to express the hope that the Government will take it up and see if it cannot do something to help our manufacturing industries.

Mr. ROCHE. I sympathize with those hon. gentlemen from the North-west in their attempts to blow hot and cold in the same breath. No person is in a better position to know the very profuse promises which were held out to the electorate of that western country and when hon. gentlemen compare these promises with the actual performances it is no wonder that we find little enthusiasm in the addresses delivered by them to this House. A goodly portion of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen consisted of a mildly condemnatory criticism of the tariff, but they are careful not to say too much to injure their party. They all, however, agree in saying that this tariff policy is merely an instalment of what is yet to come. Do these hon. gentlemen desire to make this Government a Government on the instalment plan? One would imagine they did. But, Sir, that is the very thing to which the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite objected in their predecessors. They objected to the repeated tinkering with the old tariff. What