

Mr. ADAMSON: This is a matter concerning a veteran, and since it is a general case I think it should be discussed on section 1.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. There should not be a general discussion of a specific case on section 1. This matter should be discussed under section 3, and I suggest to the hon. member for York West that he also reserve his remarks until that time.

Mr. ADAMSON: This is not a particular case. It deals with the general principle of the bill, and it is along the same line, in regard to the veterans preference, which I do not see comes under section 3 (a). The case is that of three veterans who started in the trucking business; the Minister of National Revenue knows about the case also.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I think the committee must determine now whether or not it will abide by the rules of the house. I am in the hands of the committee, but according to my interpretation of the rules the discussion upon which the hon. member is now entering would be out of order at the moment, but would be in order under section 3, certainly, and possibly under section 2. It would certainly not be in order under section 1.

Mr. GREEN: With all deference, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that you have not yet heard what the hon. member for York West has to state. He has not gone along far enough to make his case, and I suggest that the discussion which has taken place has really been upon the general administration of the plan. Surely hon. members are in order in asking questions of that type. I have never known the Chairman to prevent discussion of that kind on the first section of a bill.

Mr. ABBOTT: If I may add a word, perhaps it is always a little hard to draw the line between what can and what cannot be discussed under section 1. Perhaps matters relating to the general administration of the bill can be brought up under that section, though I believe that is open to question; but I think specific cases referring to the enforcement of prohibitions, when that is felt to be unfair, or the refusal to give quotas, or the giving of inadequate quotas, should be dealt with under the proper sections; in the case of prohibitions, when we are discussing schedule I, and in the case of quotas, when we are discussing schedule II, which is the quota schedule. Section 3 is the broad, enabling section which provides that no goods will be imported into Canada that are set forth in schedules I, II and III, except under permit; and I should think the door would be pretty

[Mr. Bentley.]

wide open under that section for almost any question of a general nature that might be raised. But is it pretty hard to deal with specific cases under section I.

Mr. ADAMSON: This is a general case that I want to bring up under section I, and it is along the line of the case previously discussed, in regard to veterans. Here is a case where I think clarification is needed, and I believe this is the section under which it could be given. We were discussing the case of a veteran who owned only fifty per cent of the business. Apparently under the bill he is debarred. Here is the case of three brothers who have invested or borrowed from the government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. In fairness to the hon. member for Swift Current, I do not think I should allow the hon. member for York West to bring up a specific case. To me it is obvious that it does not come under section I of this bill. Definitely it comes under section 3. If the committee wishes to disregard the rules of the house that is agreeable to me, but unless the committee so indicates it is my duty to enforce the rules.

Mr. ABBOTT: If I may add just one word, if the committee will look at section 4 it will be seen that this section deals with exceptional hardship, and the minister is given discretion to allow goods in where there are circumstances which, in his opinion, constitute exceptional hardship. Under that section I should think it would be quite in order to bring up cases which hon. members may feel are unfair; but to do so under section 1, which is the title section, I think is completely out of order.

Mr. ADAMSON: I was not complaining that this case was unfair; I merely wanted to get clarification on a general matter. Here is an instance where we have a veteran owning fifty per cent. Then there is the other question where three veterans are partners, and one is not. Are they debarred under this section?

Mr. ABBOTT: When we come to section 3 I shall try to answer that.

Mr. FRASER: How much has the country saved in United States dollars under this emergency plan of allowing only \$150 for travel in the United States?

Mr. ABBOTT: It is impossible to say; any answer given could be only an estimate. Expenditures of Canadians travelling in the United States can be estimated, but only with a reasonable degree of accuracy. The amount which will be saved by restricting those who travel in dollar areas for pleasure purposes