

Mr. RALSTON: Who?

Mr. MATTHEWS: I think there were two entries; one by Thomas Bonar and Company.

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to know. We will be some time on this item and I should like to know if the Thomas Bonar case was the first jute twine case.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Yes, it is known as the Bonar case. That was the first case.

Mr. RALSTON: The department assessed these importers the full dumping duty, claiming that a fixed valuation for duty purposes, which had been made by the minister, was applicable to that particular importation. Is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS: Yes, I think that is correct.

Mr. RALSTON: What was the date of the entry?

Mr. MATTHEWS: It was long before my time and I am not as familiar with the matter as I might otherwise be, but I think it was some time last summer.

Mr. RALSTON: Was that entry based on a ministerial order which had increased the original order that the minister had made fixing the value for duty purposes?

Mr. MATTHEWS: I am informed that it was based on a value fixed by the then minister under the authority of an order in council.

Mr. RALSTON: Was it the second order which had been made by the minister? There were two orders. He made an order in the first place fixing the value for duty purposes, soon after the order in council was passed authorizing the minister to make an order of that kind; and later, I understand, the minister made another order which in effect increased the value for duty purposes.

Mr. MATTHEWS: That was long before my time; I have not the papers.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not expect the minister to have personal knowledge of it at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS: I am afraid I cannot answer the question.

Mr. RALSTON: Could the minister get the information from the officers?

Mr. MATTHEWS: Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. RALSTON: Can the minister get it to-night for us, on the floor?

Mr. MATTHEWS: I am afraid I cannot get it to-night.

Mr. EULER: What is the total number of appeals made against the imposition of the dumping duty in that connection?

Mr. MATTHEWS: I am informed that that does not come under our department.

Mr. RALSTON: In order that the minister may understand what I have in mind,—probably he has been in the department long enough to know the general setting of the case—may I give an outline of it? As I understand, in 1931 an order in council was passed, P.C. 2874, which authorized the minister—not this minister but his predecessor—to fix a value for duty purposes of jute twine under section 43, and I understand that following that, on November 30, 1931, an order was made by the minister fixing the value for duty purposes of jute twine. So that it may be on the record, I will read that order:

Section 43, Customs Act
Jute Twine
Order in Council (P.C. 2874)
30th November, 1931
Minimum Value for Duty

Under authority granted by order in council (P.C. 2874) dated 30th November, 1931, I hereby fix the minimum value for duty of Jute Twine as follows:—

	Sterling per lb.	U.S. currency per lb.
Twines made from 1 lea yarns sometimes known as No. 48 yarns from coarser yarns yarns such as $\frac{3}{4}$ lea (72 lb.) or $\frac{1}{2}$ lea (96 lb.)	4-1d	7-0c
Twines made from 2 lea (24 lb.) yarns	5-3d	9-0c
Twines made from 3 lea (16 lb.) or 4 lea yarns (12 lb.) or finer yarns	7d	11-8c
F.O.B. factory.		

The above values not to apply to importations bona fide purchased on or before date of issuance of the bulletin and imported and entered at Customs within one month thereafter.

Dated at Ottawa, this 3rd day of December, 1931.

Sgd. E. B. Ryckman,
Minister of National Revenue.

Following that order there appeared appraiser's bulletin, No. 3783, which was sent to me by Mr. Blair, the assistant commissioner, recently. That bulletin contained the values for duty purposes set out in the minister's order of November 30, 1931. Now here is the point. That order which was made in 1931 applied to all importations of jute twine. On November 25, 1932, this house passed an act which amended section 43 and provided in effect that that section should not apply