

Mr. ILSLEY: Precisely.

Mr. RHODES: This increased duty was imposed as a preference, the idea being to divert as much of this trade as possible to the mother country, and it does divert it to the extent to which it comes in free. The argument that there is an increased cost to the consumer falls entirely by the way. The item comes in free today just as it did under the government which my hon. friend supported. It has been suggested that because I did not wish to give names I was withholding information which should properly be given. I do not wish for one moment to withhold any information which this committee should properly have. If the committee insists, I shall give the names, but I do not see that any good purpose will be served.

Mr. YOUNG: We insist.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is there any reason why we should not have them?

Mr. RHODES: It is only a question of discussing the business of individual companies. The hon. member for Hants-Kings referred to glass, but that is an entirely different matter. In that case the duty was imposed upon the distinct understanding that the price would not be increased. It was increased, and the government acted promptly to restore the old position.

Mr. ILSLEY: There is no difference.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend apparently has a thirst for information, perhaps brought on by too much confectionery. The manufacturers of cocoa butter in Canada are Fry's and Bakers. I am informed that all the other confectionery manufacturers are importers of this commodity.

Mr. YOUNG: Could the minister give us the number of employees and the wages paid?

Mr. RHODES: I have not those statistics.

Mr. RYCKMAN: And the ages of the wives.

Mr. YOUNG: If my hon. friend is interested in that information, he can get it, but we are not. What we are interested in and what we have a right to know is how many employees will be supported by this form of regulation, what they receive in wages, and what it will cost the country. I have no desire to make political capital for the Liberal party out of this incident, but the minister has stated that the duties were the same under the Liberal government. I say they were not, because at that time the preference meant free entry. There was no dump duty on exchange, and that is the

[Mr. Rhodes.]

manner in which the increase has come about. My hon. friends opposite have said: of course, the British pound is below par and we must add a special dump duty of 69 cents on a valuation of \$3.73, or something like eighteen per cent. We never did that. Then in addition, there is the three per cent excise tax.

Mr. CANTLEY: You never did anything.

Mr. YOUNG: We never did that. The rate, free, under the Liberal regime was f-r-e-e. Now it means twenty-one per cent. We would like to have this information.

Mr. RHODES: I am sorry but I have not that information.

Mr. YOUNG: I suggest that the item stand until the minister can give the committee the number of employees and the wages paid.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend may ask for the figures, but they are not obtainable. I am advised that the Bureau of Statistics does not compile figures unless more than three or four industries are affected; therefore the figures are not obtainable.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not wish to intervene in this part of the debate for long, but I remember distinctly that during the special session the Prime Minister said that he was raising the tariff in order to decrease unemployment. At the same time he indicated the relation that existed in his mind between high tariff and employment. Therefore, if the Minister of Finance is a true disciple of the Prime Minister, he must follow in his footsteps, and in that case he must undoubtedly learn before raising the tariff, the number of people who will benefit from that increase in securing work. I base my argument on the Prime Minister's statement: This is why I believe it is very strong.

Mr. YOUNG: There is another question I should like to ask the minister. He says that this was done with the object of giving Britain a preference. I want to ask him whether the British delegates asked for this preference and, if they did, whether they understood it would amount to only two or three per cent.

Mr. RHODES: I shall not for a moment attempt to become responsible for what the understanding of the British delegates was in respect to the implications of this or any other item of the tariff. I can only assume, as do hon. gentlemen opposite and, I think, quite properly, that the British are shrewd traders, keen business men, and they knew very well what they were about.

Item agreed to.