

currency to save them precisely the type of inconvenience you have mentioned. We have often authorized the keeping of imprest funds in United States currency for precisely that type of business, for convenience.

Q. What do they do? I haven't heard of them doing it. I suppose some of them do it without getting a permit, I should think. What do you have to do to get it? Do you have to send a letter to the board? I suppose you are frequently called upon to make emergency trips to the United States and you could have permission then to keep say \$100 or \$200 of American currency without going to the board. Is that what happens?—A. Yes, then if they state that for their ordinary purposes they need, have occasion to make frequent trips to the States, then they are authorized to buy lump sum amounts of United States currency from the bank. They are also given special business travel permits, which are what you might call a continuous form H, which relieves them of the necessity of applying to the bank for form H each time they cross the border, and they are authorized to replace that imprest fund as they use it up in travel.

Q. What is the meaning of "imprest" there? They can replenish their petty cash account, is that what it means?—A. Yes, that is right.

Q. I suppose it gets over that difficulty then— —A. If I could just say this, Mr. Jackman; we have had six years of experience in trying to meet various types of difficulty and I can assure you that we have been successful in many cases. We are continuing as far as it is humanly possible so to do to minimize any inconvenience which may be associated with a measure of this kind. That certainly has been our objective.

Mr. MARQUIS: I do not know the proper section which it comes under, but I would suggest that an amount might be fixed. Many people all over the country, farmers for instance, are going to the United States, and they bring back with them some dollars in United States currency. They are offending the law, and most people do not want to offend. I think this situation should be corrected. I know the board will not prosecute them, but they are infringing the law.

Mr. JACKMAN: It kind of gets them into bad habits.

Mr. MARQUIS: Yes. Don't you think it would be desirable to fix that amount at say \$25 perhaps and then people will know that they can keep that amount?

The WITNESS: I think consideration might be given to that. Theoretically, \$25 per person for 10,000,000 Canadians is \$250,000,000, which is potentially a large sum to risk having go out of official reserves into private hands, but this amount would not of course be held. One would have to take into consideration the effect that such an exemption, if incorporated into legislation, would have if it became necessary to face again a condition similar to what we had in 1940 where there was a complete prohibition of pleasure travel to the United States. One would of course merely be inviting evasion if such a provision were incorporated in legislation.

Mr. MARQUIS: You could fix it by regulation.

The WITNESS: That would provide fewer difficulties because then it could be changed in relation to exchange conditions. I will be very glad to bring that to the attention of the minister as one of the things to be considered when the regulations are being drafted under this Act.

Mr. JACKMAN: Please do not put too much emphasis on the \$250,000,000.

The WITNESS: It is a very theoretical figure.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 57.

Carried.