

glass we find that while the government has decreased the British rate by $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, it has increased the intermediate rate $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. STEVENS: No; there is a reduction of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The figure before me appears to be $1\frac{1}{2}$ but it may be blurred.

Mr. RHODES: The figures on the right hon. gentleman's schedule may be blurred, but he will find the old rate was $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My copy reads $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, but there may be a flaw in the printing. I beg the minister's pardon. Then, let us take the next item. We find that there has been an increase in the intermediate rate from $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 25 per cent, making the intermediate and general tariffs the same. That change would prevent any arrangement being made with another country. Then, in connection with "plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes not exceeding seven square feet each, n.o.p." the British preferential rate is changed from $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to free, and in both the intermediate and general rates there is a change from 10 per cent to 25 per cent. Clearly that change is made to shut out the foreigners.

In other words a survey of the schedules taken together shows a net result of a very considerable increase in duty on articles needed for purposes of construction and shelter, articles which serve domestic, business and commercial ends.

Mr. RHODES: The right hon. gentleman omitted to indicate that in connection with common and colourless window glass, where the duty was formerly $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent it is now made free.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister indicated that before.

Mr. RHODES: Quite so. Concerning glass in sheets, where the duty was formerly $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent it is wiped out entirely.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I mentioned that.

Mr. RHODES: Then, the right hon. gentleman referred to plate glass, not bevelled, and stated that there had been increases in the intermediate and general rates. He did not lay stress on the fact that we had wiped out entirely the former duty which obtained under the British preference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes I did.

Mr. RHODES: The right hon. gentleman did not refer to item 321, "plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes exceeding seven square feet each, and not exceeding twenty-five feet each, n.o.p." In connection with that item the former rates were: British preferential tariff, 15 per cent; intermediate tariff, 25 per cent and general tariff, $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The new rates are: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 25 per cent; general tariff, 25 per cent. The committee will note that the British preferential rate is free, that the intermediate rate has not been disturbed and that the general rate has been reduced $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. VENIOT: In connection with item 318 I should like to point out that while the Minister of Trade and Commerce has complained that hon. members on this side of the house have not been quite fair, in giving reasons why the government have abolished the duty on plain glass he himself was not fair. What are the facts? I believe it was on September 17, 1930, that the item was first dealt with. At that time the tariff on imports of plain glass was changed from $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem to a specific duty of $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.

Immediately, on September 23, two or three days after the change had been made, importers of glass in Canada sent out circular letters in which they pointed out that on account of this increase in duty a 120 pound box of plain glass which had formerly cost \$5.63 would have to be sold wholesale for a little over \$11. I remember well that when the change was made I pointed out that it could not be satisfactory. I asked the minister if it would not be possible to leave the item, and to make a provision in it to the effect that when a Canadian firm could supply the demand, the specific duty should apply. The reply from the Prime Minister was that the item could not be so treated. He said they had received an absolute guarantee from a firm in East Hamilton that the increase in duty would not involve an increased price to the consumers. What are the facts? The letter from the firm in east Hamilton did not lay down any such proposition. The letter laid down this proposition: As the cost of production is lowered by the increased production we will give the benefit of the lower cost to the consumer.

An hon. MEMBER: Is that the assurance?

Mr. VENIOT: Now, one minute. It was stated on the floor of this house that within three or four weeks 350 to 400 men would be employed in East Hamilton. Was that