

experience at that port to date. From May 1 to May 24 inclusive at Fort Erie there were 443 exemptions to the amount of \$12,042.58. On May 25 there were 465 exemptions to the value of \$9,566.38. It will be remembered that May 25 was a holiday, the Monday following Sunday, May 24, and I am informed that about 3,200 Canadian cars entered through the port of Fort Erie on that day, but there were only 465 exemptions. I do not know how many persons there would be in a car, possibly three; so that the experience at Fort Erie would indicate that a very small proportion of those returning from the United States are claiming this exemption. If there were only one person in each car the proportion would be less than fifteen per cent. If there were three persons to each car the proportion would be about five per cent, and that was after a long week-end which included a holiday. Our experience at Fort Erie in connection with the claiming of the exemption shows that advantage will not be taken of it to any very great extent. The average of exemptions claimed to date at that port has been about \$24, and I am informed that the experience there corresponds closely with that at other ports throughout Canada.

With regard to the provision respecting liquor may I point out that the United States has a similar one which, while not specifically mentioning liquor, permits the importation of Canadian liquor into that country to the extent of \$100. The whole of the \$100 worth of goods going into the United States may be liquor. But in the case of a prohibition state, state law would govern, and it would never be contended, as the hon. member has argued, that it would be an indecent thing for congress of the United States to enact a law limiting the exemption to \$100. It would not be an indecent thing at all, but would be a provision stating simply that so far as the United States are concerned they do not propose to allow an exemption over \$100 on liquor. If the law of a state prevented a person from having liquor in his possession in that state, then that would be the law to which the returning American tourist would have regard and which he would be obliged to respect.

For instance, we shall suppose that two of the provinces of Canada were next week to repeal their laws respecting the possession of small quantities of foreign intoxicating liquor. Would it still be indecent on our part to have this provision in the tariff, namely that an exemption of over one quart could not be claimed? When we provide for an exemption of \$100 we say that such exemption shall not apply to liquor. We will not permit the Canadian tourist to bring in \$100 worth of

[Mr. Ilesley.]

liquor, irrespective of provincial laws. We will permit him to bring in only one quart of liquor. This is not an authorization or invitation to any person to break a provincial law. If the provinces actually desire to maintain their present position—and I shall be very much surprised if they do, on account of the amount of liquor they sell to American tourists coming to Canada—then it will be illegal to bring liquor into Canada. But as I say, I shall be surprised if the provinces maintain that position.

Mr. STEVENS: Apart from the provision respecting exemptions for tourists, when an ordinary importer of liquor clears liquor at Montreal, Quebec or any other point, and provincial authorities have a law against the possession of such liquor, what does the importer have to do to bring himself within the ambit of provincial law? Would an individual tourist be called upon to take a course different from that followed by the ordinary importer?

Mr. ILSLEY: There is no ordinary importer. The liquor commissions may import liquor, and there may be certain other classes of importers licensed to import liquor in bond; perhaps that would depend upon the law of the province. But there is no right on the part of the ordinary individual to import liquor, unless it is for sacramental or medicinal purposes.

Mr. WHITE: Do the words "alcoholic liquors" appear in the United States tariff item relating to the free entry of goods brought back to that country by American tourists?

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. WHITE: Then why do we insert those words in this item?

Mr. ILSLEY: To restrict the free entry to a quart, so that \$100 worth may not be brought in.

Mr. WHITE: If the provision were knocked out altogether the liquor could not come in.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, but we do not want to do that, in case the provinces change their attitude.

Mr. WILTON: According to the figures quoted by the Minister of National Revenue it would appear that only a few hundred cars crossed from Canada into the United States over the holiday.

Mr. DUNNING: He did not say that.

Mr. WILTON: He referred to a few hundred cars.

Mr. ILSLEY: There were 3,200.