

Dingman and Company. Unless I am mistaken some of the packers manufacture soap as well. There is a large number of soap manufacturers, and I submit this to my hon. friend from Weyburn, who has pretty stubborn views on matters of tariff: Does he honestly think it is reasonable to expect us to come here with all such information, including the number of employees? We can get it, but it is practically impossible to carry on the business of the house and bring all such information here. I ask the committee to take my word for this: I assure them that the manufacturers of soap did not come here asking for any increase in the duty on that commodity. Will they accept that as a very definite statement from me? I submit further that in these two items there is a lowering of the tariff to Great Britain. They are items in respect to where we might reasonably expect some increase of business with Great Britain, and the consumers in this country will not suffer a particle because, let me point this out to my hon. friend, the soap business is well diversified. In Canada quite a number of manufacturers are competing one with another, and in addition to that a number of manufacturers of soap in Great Britain who probably have not been exporting to this market may get in under this item with the reduced tariff. There is nothing whatever in the item that is alarming or that will cause any disturbance. In view of the fact that we have certainly done our best on this and other items to give to the committee the fullest possible information, I submit to my hon. friends that they should not press for this unduly.

In regard to the passing of the item, we all know that these items are not submitted formally in the way of reading a resolution and so forth. By courtesy from one side to the other we pass these items in perhaps an informal way. There was, however, no intention on this side to force the item through. I submit that we are trying reasonably to meet, as courteously as we can, the wishes of my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. YOUNG: I have no complaint to make about the courtesy of either of the ministers, but my hon. friend asks whether it is reasonable for us to request the ministry to come down to the house with all this information for which we are asking. I shall answer his question by asking another: Is it reasonable of the government to ask us to pass this legislation, which will affect the price of these commodities to the Canadian people, without our knowing or making some attempt to find

[Mr. Stevens.]

out what the effect will be in additional cost to us, and what benefit we shall receive for this protection to Canadian manufacturers?—for it is nothing else. Does he not think it is reasonable for us to have this information, so that when we go back to the country to justify his action, we shall be able to tell the people what benefit we are to get from it?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have been keeping perfectly still, waiting to hear the explanations for all these increases in the intermediate and general tariffs. There are 138 of them in the whole of this schedule, and it becomes more apparent than ever that this agreement will work detrimentally to the interests of the Canadian consumer. Another thing that is apparent is that wherever a manufacturer's item happens to be in question, it is given some preference, but on the other hand, if it is a consumer's item or one touching any of the basic industries, an increase is provided. I just want to say to my hon. friend and to some hon. gentlemen on the other side who are now objecting so strenuously to this item standing over, that when they come to examine these schedules they will find they are not just what they looked like at first glance. So far as I am concerned, I still oppose this agreement as vigorously as I can. I am waiting for the iron and textile items to voice more strenuous opposition, but may I say, in passing, that it becomes more apparent, when you hear the explanation of the ministry and look carefully into the schedules, what a neat piece of work this was as against the consuming public of Canada. They are the people who are going to pay the piper in both instances, and unfortunately we get from England nothing but what we have always had, and that is entry into their market free.

Mr. COOTE: Can the minister give the committee any reason why there is a reduction in the British preferential tariff on two kinds of soap, that is, common or laundry soap and castile soap, while the great range of toilet soaps, large quantities of which are used in this country, is not changed at all? Is there any reason why there should not be an increase in the British preference on toilet soap?

Mr. RHODES: The best explanation I can give to my hon. friend is that as to the first kind of soap, it was a matter of agreement; these items were satisfactory to our British associates. The other soaps to which my hon. friend refers are in the main a luxury soap and therefore ought to carry a substantial rate of duty.