

to see this gesture on the part of the government towards lowering duties, by saying to the people "We are going to admit this article free from Great Britain." That enabled my hon. friend from North Huron (Mr. Spotton) to go to South Huron during the by-election and say that at heart he was really a free trader, and it has enabled my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) to say that these agreements really are low tariff measures. I think everyone in this house will remember that last session the minister said he was going through the items in his department with a fine tooth comb in order to see what articles could be imported into this country from Great Britain. Apparently he has found some, though they are not very visible to most of us.

Let me show hon. members how this will work out. During the fiscal year 1931-32 we imported fertilizer from all countries to the value of \$3,367,000, and of that total how much do you think came from Great Britain? Only \$20,000 worth. Formerly there was a duty of five per cent on that article when compounded and manufactured outside of Canada, so apparently this government has reduced by five per cent the duty on one-half of one per cent of all the fertilizer brought into this country. Let us put that in another way so that it may be understood more easily. By way of indemnity each member receives \$3,600. One-half of one per cent of that amount would be \$18, and a five per cent reduction on that \$18 would amount to 90 cents. I wonder if the Minister of Trade and Commerce could even find a reduction like that on the fine tooth comb he used in his department. Did the hon. gentlemen I have named the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of the Interior, all representing agricultural constituencies, vote for these increases when they were discussed by the cabinet? Are these hon. gentlemen in the cabinet in the interests of agriculture or are they there to keep silent while the ministers interested in the textile industry threaten to resign unless that industry is fully protected?

Let me show how this change will work out on a dozen pairs of wool hosiery costing 15s. 6d. In 1930, with the pound at \$4.86 $\frac{2}{3}$, these would cost \$3.77. The 25 per cent duty, less 10 per cent, and the one per cent sales tax would bring the cost to \$4.67, so the total duty and sales tax would amount to 23 per cent of the cost price. In 1931, before the depreciation of the pound and after this government came into power, the total tax would amount to \$5.98, or 58 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in all. In

[Mr. Gray.]

1932, previous to the conference, the duty, sales and excise taxes and dumping duty would total \$5.84, or 97 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, while in 1932, after the conference, they would total \$5.60, or 89 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, a reduction of 24 cents.

A little later on I intend to say something with regard to the arbitrary powers of this government in dealing with the customs tariff, but just here let me point out what would happen to a man going to the customs office to obtain these goods. First of all he would present his bill of lading or invoice, showing that he had paid 15s. 6d., which, with the pound at \$3.82, would amount to \$2.96. Then he would tell the collector he wanted to pay the duty, whatever it might be. The customs collector would tell him first of all that he must pay the duty not on the depreciated pound but on the pound sterling, which, at 30 per cent less 10 per cent, would amount to \$1.02. Then he would be told that he must pay a specific duty of 75 cents a dozen, less 10 per cent, amounting to 68 cents. He might ask, "Is that all?" but he would be told, "No, you must pay a 6 per cent sales tax and a 3 per cent excise tax, amounting to 33 cents and 16 cents respectively." He would pay those taxes and ask for his parcel, but he would be told that there was still another tax, the dumping duty, which was not calculated either on the pound sterling or on the depreciated pound but on an arbitrary rate fixed from day to day, which for that day had been fixed at \$4.40. So this man would have to pay a dumping duty of 45 cents on that arbitrary value, bringing his total cost to \$5.60, and if he had that much money in his possession he would be permitted to take his parcel.

I have referred to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of National Defence and I was going to say a word about the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion). I am sorry he is just leaving, because I was going to say some nice things about him, together with some other things perhaps not quite so nice. We always enjoy his breezy style. May I say that there is no one in the house who gives more attention to the debates than does the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. The trouble with the hon. gentleman—his speeches given in the house have demonstrated it—is that he spent so much time during the conference sessions giving out rosy pictures to the press of the daily happenings that he has not yet been able to get rid of the camouflage. I am afraid all that we can get from that speech