

Mr. Howell: You will notice that we struck it out old section 93 because it had relation only to the entry of goods where there was a suspicion of fraud. Actually, I do not think we have ever had a case of fraud here, and even if we did suspect fraud we would be obliged for our own protection to call the importer in. I do not think it is necessary to have those words in here. We did not notice the problem until a few days ago, but this would force us to require the importer to be present every time we opened a package, and this would stop our operations.

The Chairman: What is the view of the committee? Is the committee prepared to amend this section by striking out those words?

Senator Thorvaldson: I think Mr. Howell can speak to that better than any other person here. He probably was speaking to it, but I did not hear what he said. However, it seems to me that you create for yourselves a great administrative problem by putting in those words. What happens if the importer says he will not go? Probably you were referring to that.

Mr. Howell: Yes, I was referring to that, because the release of goods would come to a standstill if we had to wait for the arrival of the importer or his agent.

Senator Thorvaldson: He may never come.

Mr. Howell: That is right, he may never come.

Senator Carter: Is this a new section What did you do previously?

Mr. Howell: Look at section 95(1) on the right hand page. It is one package in ten, do you see?

Senator Carter: So you had the right to open in one in ten, whether he was present or not?

Mr. Howell: That is right.

Senator Carter: How did this provision with respect to having a person present arise?

Mr. Howell: Are you referring to the words "in the presence of", and so on?

Senator Carter: Yes.

Mr. Howell: Actually they came out of section 93.

Senator Carter: I see.

Mr. Howell: There was a little mixup there.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Hon. Senators: Carried.

The Chairman: So, we will amend the new section 93 by striking out the words "in the presence of the importer thereof or his agent".

Senator Thorvaldson: I take it that the department wants that?

The Chairman: The department supports the amendment.

Section 5: This is simply the repeal of sections 95 to 97 of the act. These were specific provisions in connection with examinations, and they are no longer necessary. Is that correct, Mr. Howell?

Mr. Howell: These sections had reference to an examining warehouse. We no longer send goods to a central warehouse, because we examine goods on the spot in the warehouse at which they arrive in Canada, whether they arrive by steamship, railway, highway, or air. We do not bring goods into a central point.

The Chairman: Section 6, at the top of page 3, deals with refund for alleged inferiority or deficiency. This has to do with sales tax, does it not?

Mr. Howell: No, sir.

The Chairman: Has this also to do with customs entry?

Mr. Howell: Yes.

The Chairman: If you are looking for uniformity, Senator Hastings, I would point out that you have a period of ninety days here.

Senator Hastings: But it is still stated in days.

Mr. Howell: I will call on Mr. Hind, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Customs, because this is in his area.

Mr. A. R. Hind (Assistant Deputy Minister, Customs, Department of National Revenue): Mr. Chairman, this has the effect of extending to 90 days, from the existing 30 days, the period of time in which an importer can report to the collector any shortage of goods or any deficiency in quality of the goods. Heretofore it has been 30 days, although I should say that there is in existence now an order in council which increases the period