Customs Tariff

Mr. Ritchie (York East): Mr. Chairman, each of these rates that are affected were negotiated in specific trade agreements with the countries concerned, and it is true that for these products we are beginning to phase out the British preferential advantages or, in some cases, even a greater advantage than the general British preferential tariff. Therefore, the hon. member summed things up beautifully when he said at the end we are simply phasing these out. We are, but this is a phasing-out.

He will notice that the agreement with Australia will be extended by an additional year beyond what the tariff board recommended. That was because, although we have not had the formal negotiations, we had an indication from Australia that they would be a little more favourable to us with regard to cherries exported from here to there if we spread this out a little bit.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to.

On clause 14-Coming into force

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, clause 14 refers to bringing goods out of warehouses for consumption. I would like to know what effect this will have on strawberries, for instance, that are in warehouses in Canada. We have large quantities of canned strawberries in warehouses. During a period when we restrict the importation of fresh strawberries, will this have an effect on how we trigger this section? Is it related in any way to the tariff or the duty we put on a commodity that may be in conflict with a commodity that we have in storage in warehouses? I suppose it can be related to eggs that are in storage. During a period when the price of fresh laid eggs goes up considerably and there is a shortage, those eggs are brought out of storage. They would not be in competition with fresh laid eggs as they are stored eggs, but is this the purpose of clause 14, or does it have another purpose?

• (1640)

Mr. Ritchie (York East): Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this clause puts the act into effect, and because goods in bonded warehouses are not considered to have yet been imported even though they are physically in the country, the wording is designed to ensure that they shall not escape. So when they are entered for consumption by being taken out of the bonded warehouses, they are covered by this act forthwith.

Clause agreed to.

On schedule I—

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, schedule I has a very limited application which ended October 31. Will members of Parliament and the people of this country be informed how much of the schedule was put into application, at what time and what the change in the duty collected would be? In other words, how does the accounting for this schedule appear and in what form? There should be some accounting as to how much of it applied and what the effect of the application was. This does not appear in the bill. How do we find out the form in which [Mr. Peters.]

the Tariff Board brought the schedule forward? Will it be in the form that will match what is in schedule I? My guess is that it will not, that we will never know one way or the other.

The parliamentary secretary is taking a long time to answer. It may be that the answer is not available, and if it is not, then as the Englishman would say, "pity". If there is no indication available then we are certainly sloppy bookkeepers in this country. If there is, we would like to know what effect it has had. Questions have been asked during the study of the bill. We are being very generous in giving the tariff board this bill in such a stupid form if they do not have to account for it.

Mr. Ritchie (York East): Mr. Chairman, I was waiting because I thought another hon. member was seeking the floor. The items in schedule I were in effect from March until October and most of them have now been included in the new and continuing bill through schedule V. I believe. There are four items which continue to be effective in schedule I, and I can give the hon. member the names of those items. In their cases, there is no increase in the tariffs applying in the closed season. Those items are peas, dried apples, raisins and currants. Otherwise, the items in schedule I, in effect, are picked up by schedule V. Until this act became effective on October 24, schedule I covered the conditions on these commodities during the summer months. I would also remind the hon. member that I indicated earlier the effect of that on the collection of duty, which was a decline of about \$5 million from what would have existed without those changes.

Mr. Peters: I was of the opinion that some of the tariffs applied only because we did not increase any of them. It is not easy to pick the commodities out because the former price is not there, but only those which went down were selected. The tariffs which went up, if any, did not apply, and I understand that there were some which did not apply. This is why I feel there should be some kind of accounting for the schedule. We are merely going through a ritual in passing this bill, because we do not know how much it will cost, how much we will get out of it or how it applies in certain areas, although the individuals involved will probably know. I ask whether there will be a later accounting of what this schedule has cost, and although the expense will decrease nobody seems to know. I believe the estimate is \$5 million.

When this bill takes effect, schedule V will apply and schedule I will no longer apply. At this point there should be a simple accounting of how much it will cost to put that schedule into effect. There is a lot of other information which I would like to have. Is this schedule helping anybody? Is it keeping some businesses in operation? It is a subsidy to the industry. We are giving out \$5 million, and we are entitled to know if it helped and, if so, by how much. How much did it actually cost and where did the money go? Maybe this \$5 million did not produce anything, but we will pass it anyway.

[Translation]

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to obtain a clarification on schedule I, tariff item No. 9,007-1, potatoes, frozen,