

a comparison on certain commodities and give it to my hon. friend tomorrow. But I submit to him and to the committee: it is not profitable nor does it add to the information of the committee to raise on each item these hypothetical cases. We do not wish to be discourteous; we do not wish to say to my hon. friend each time: We do not agree with your figuring; we think you are wrong. I am quite certain the gentleman who has helped my hon. friend to do his figuring—my hon. friend will admit he has a good adviser in this—could undoubtedly figure it out quite well; but I think in some of the figures he gave he was calculating on the basis of a rate of exchange that must have been applicable a month or two ago. Therefore nothing is to be added to the arguments here or to the clarifying of matters by these more or less futile discussions over hypothetical cases.

Mr. YOUNG: I do not think the problem is quite as difficult as the Minister of Trade and Commerce would seem to believe. The normal value of the pound is \$4.86½. The government has said that it should be \$4.40. The actual value fluctuates from day to day, so to avoid the difficulty my hon. friend mentions of having to take account of the fluctuations from day to day, every two weeks the department sets an average value for those two weeks. The other day, November 10, it issued this bulletin: "The average value of the pound sterling declared by the department for special duty purposes is \$3.71, effective for entries during the period November 16 to 30, 1932." The actual value of the pound yesterday was \$3.73 Canadian funds. The government had declared the average value for the present two weeks to be \$3.71. They have also declared that the pound should be \$4.40. I have been calling it an exchange dumping duty, but my hon. friend prefers to call it an exchange adjustment duty. I do not care what he calls it; it is a duty anyway; but that duty, whatever it is, shall be the difference between \$4.40 and the rate they have fixed of \$3.71, or sixty-nine cents. So that particular duty will be sixty-nine cents on an investment of Canadian money of \$3.73. It is only a simple matter in arithmetic to figure out that that amounts to 18½ per cent. That is how I have arrived at this exchange adjustment duty, if my hon. friend prefers to call it that.

What I have been asking all along is that the minister take the ad valorem or specific rate, or both, as the case may be, based not on the invoice value of the goods in Canad-

ian currency, but on what is declared to be the value for duty; figure that out; add to it this 18½ per cent and whatever the excise tax amounts to, and give us the total. In addition I believe there is ten per cent off the regular duty for direct shipment. That can be figured out. The arrangement the government has made for fixing every two weeks the average value of the pound in Canadian currency will avoid the difficulty of coming to an actual estimate. I do not see why we cannot have that total rate submitted to the committee in a few minutes. When we are passing these items, we have a right to know what the actual rate is going to be. I would be willing to wait until tomorrow, but by tomorrow many of these items will be through, and we want to know and have it right on the record exactly what the rate will be against Great Britain.

Mr. DONNELLY: Just before six o'clock, when we were discussing item 253, I asked the minister to tell me what duty I would actually have to pay if I bought that article in England. I wonder if he can give me the figure now.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend is on precisely the same question as the hon. member for Weyburn. I have told him we cannot give that computation now, but we shall do the best we can to give it before the committee rises.

Mr. DONNELLY: I make the same protest as does the hon. member for Weyburn. I understood we were to have this at eight o'clock. It would take only a minute or two to get it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that it was difficult to arrive at prices. There should be no difficulty about that. We have the price scale of goods in England, in the United States and in different parts of the world. We can take the average price for those goods and figure out what the duty will be. In England, when they went off the pound sterling, it was believed the price of goods there would go up; on the contrary, it went down two per cent. In the meantime in the United States the price of goods has dropped about 14 per cent, so the price of goods in England, by her going off the gold standard, has been kept up by about 12 per cent. It is not very difficult to figure out what these duties should be.

The hon. member for Weyburn, in figuring this out, has neglected one factor. The pound sterling at the present time is worth something in the neighbourhood of \$3.73. The government calculates the duty not on \$3.73, the amount paid for the goods, or on \$4.40,