

in view of his criticisms and those of his colleagues. There is a small increase under this item.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Under the Dunning budget there were only about six items in connection with which the duty was increased.

Mr. RHODES: Eleven.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I imagine the minister is splitting some of the items. In the present instance there are over one hundred and thirty items, without splitting at all, under which the duty is increased in the intermediate and general tariffs, and a very large number in connection with which the duty is increased against Great Britain.

Mr. YOUNG: If the minister has the Dunning budget before him perhaps he would point out an item in it in which the effective rate from Great Britain was made higher than it was under the general or intermediate tariffs.

Mr. RHODES: Yes; if the hon. member will look at item 377a in the Dunning budget he will find that the preference against Great Britain had been \$1.50 per ton, but under the Dunning budget it was raised to \$2.50 a ton.

Mr. YOUNG: That is not the question I asked. I want to know if the minister could name an item in which the effective rate from Great Britain was raised to a point higher than the effective rate from other countries.

Mr. RHODES: I can only state the facts as I understand them. If the hon. member suggests that an increase from \$1.50 to \$2.50 a ton is not an effective increase, then I must say that I do not understand what an effective increase is.

Mr. YOUNG: I am speaking of comparative rates.

Mr. HEENAN: I was wondering if the minister could explain the position we are in now. Some time ago we spent many thousands of dollars, through the Department of Trade and Commerce, I think, in propagating a new creed by which school children and other citizens of Canada obligated themselves not to purchase anything but Canadian-made goods. Now we have made an agreement with another country in order that they may send goods into Canada, which we have pledged ourselves not to buy.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Amend the creed.

Item agreed to.

53719-78½

Customs tariff—378. Bars and rods, of iron or steel; billets, of iron or steel, weighing less than 60 pounds per lineal yard:—

(d) Hot rolled, valued at not less than 4 cents per pound, n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; general tariff, 15 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—378. Bars of iron or steel, hot rolled, 5 inches in diameter and larger, when imported by manufacturers of polished shafting for use in their own factories, per ton: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 7%; general tariff, 7%.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—378a, 378c. Sash or casement sections of iron or steel, hot or cold rolled, not punched, drilled nor further manufactured, when imported by manufacturers of metal window frames, for use in their own factories, per ton: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 7%; general tariff, 7%.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—380. Plates of iron or steel, hot or cold rolled:—

(a) Not more than 66 inches in width, n.o.p., per ton: British preferential tariff, \$4.25; intermediate tariff, \$8; general tariff, \$8.

(b) More than 66 inches in width, n.o.p., per ton: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, \$6; general tariff, \$6.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is a terrible one. The general tariff on plates of iron or steel has been increased from \$7 to \$8 under (a); the intermediate tariff has been increased from \$6 to \$8, so that both intermediate and general are placed on the same level. Then under (b) there is an increase in the general tariff from \$5 to \$6 and in the intermediate from \$3 to \$6—it is doubled—and British preference is left the same in each case. Those two items alone, will serve materially to increase the cost of construction and other items that enter into general production costs and costs of living in this country.

Mr. RHODES: May I point out that the three preceding items we passed showed very substantial reductions in the British preference. Naturally they passed by without comment. I do not complain of that. In the case of the increases to which my right hon. friend has just now referred, in most instances they are relatively less than they were under the Dunning budget. There the increase in one particular item that I have in mind was from \$2.50 general to \$4.50, almost double, whereas in this case the increase is from \$6 to \$8 and \$7 to \$8. So the relative increase is very much less than on the item to which I have referred.