

those exacted on foreign goods, tend to correct the defect in those treaties which we have denounced. Apparently, the difference between the duties levied on British goods and those levied on foreign goods is not quite as large as would appear from the schedules. Therefore I approve of those dispositions for the same reasons I have denounced the treaty.

Mr. RALSTON: I was not in the house yesterday, and judging by what has happened this evening it would not seem that I had missed much because, as I understand it, we are still at the stage where we are asking the government to furnish a simple computation with regard to duties. The hon. member for Labelle, who has just taken his seat, has just given his reason for supporting the government in the present instance. The reason other hon. members and I object is that it imposes undue taxation upon the people of Canada. If hon. members opposite would look across the line to the United States where, I suppose, there is some commercial intelligence, they would find that notwithstanding the change in exchange, the dump duty which is applied against sterling here has not been applied so far as the United States is concerned. Therefore we must conclude that this is an invention of the Canadian government against goods from Great Britain. We might as well settle down to that. At this time we are asking for only a simple arithmetical computation as to the amount of duty chargeable in connection with a few articles. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has said that that information will be furnished tomorrow. That is different from the statement made by the Minister of Finance, to the effect that it would be furnished tonight before the committee rose.

Mr. RHODES: No, before the committee reported the bill.

Mr. RALSTON: I thought the Minister of Finance said it would be supplied before the committee rose. At any rate we are confronted with the same difficulty all the way through the schedule. I submit that for the benefit of the government as well as of the committee we must, and ought to have the information which has been asked for. I hope the Minister of Trade and Commerce will see to it that the computation is made, and that a certain number of examples are set forth. I believe such information would show in a striking way the taxes being imposed upon the people of Canada by way of duties.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. YOUNG: No, it is not carried. The minister has given reasons why the government does not care to make the computations for which I have asked. They would not like to risk the reputation of any of the experts in government departments. They suggest hasty computations are unfair, and perhaps we cannot blame them. But I have no such reputation at stake, and I am willing to make a computation. If I am wrong, perhaps the ministers opposite will put me right. I have made a computation of what the actual applied rate will go on one British pound sterling worth of goods described in item 354a as kitchen or household hollowware of aluminum. It figures out like this: The quoted rate here from Great Britain is 20 per cent. That will be applied on \$4.86½ although the goods only cost \$3.73 Canadian. This 20 per cent on \$4.86 is equal to 26 per cent on \$3.73; that would be the ad valorem rate. There is a ten per cent reduction if the goods are shipped direct to Canada, which would leave it 23.4 per cent. Then the special excise tax of 3 per cent, which is in reality a duty, will be based on \$1.234 or 3.7 per cent. The exchange adjustment duty—my hon. friend preferred to call it by that name rather than exchange dumping duty—will be 18.5 per cent, making 45.6 per cent. In addition to that we have a portion of the 6 per cent sales tax. So my estimate is that the actual charges applied against a British shipment of these goods would be 47 per cent or more. If I am wrong, let the experts of the department say so. But I make this offer to the minister; I am willing to drop this whole matter until all these items are through the committee if the minister will promise that when we get into ways and means he will furnish us with another column to this schedule showing the actual applied rate, all things included, on all goods coming from within the British Empire.

Mr. McGIBBON: I think the hon. gentleman would have more influence with this house if he had had the courage to go a little further. Why doesn't he move that this item be struck out?

Mr. YOUNG: That would require a lot of courage.

Mr. McGIBBON: Yes, which you haven't got. The arrangement is either beneficial or it is not; that is logical, isn't it? If it is beneficial, it should pass; if it is not, those who are opposed to it should have the courage to oppose it to the extent of moving that it be struck out. Will the hon. member who has just sat down do that?