

*Customs Tariff*

Mr. BENNETT: The thirty day limit has been in force for some time.

Mr. DUNNING: For a long time. We ask the committee to accept this provision and, as I said before, we are making all arrangements possible to check carefully and completely the manner in which it works. So far we are astonished at the comparatively small degree to which the privilege is made use of.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there any understanding on the part of Americans that they will regard this as satisfactory? I have some reason for asking the question. As our concession was not as generous as theirs, an effort might be made to demand that we should make it so, or they would make theirs as restrictive as ours, on the one hand, as to the period of time within which one had to stay in the country, and on the other as to the number of times in a given year. It must be remembered that the insertion of the forty-eight hour privilege necessitates the Canadian expending money in the United States, which is a factor with respect to invisible balances; and in the second place, the limitation as to three times a year, as against eleven on their part, may afford an opportunity, which some members of congress living in nearby cities have sought, to press that the arrangement should be reciprocal.

Mr. DUNNING: We have no indication of dissatisfaction, and there was no undertaking on either side that the concessions should be either reciprocal or identical. Both countries recognized the different conditions that prevailed on either side and have recognized the right, indeed the necessity, of each being free in the matter.

Mr. STEWART: I should like to have from the minister an explanation of his statement that care was being taken to check up these imports. Is it intended to take an inventory of the goods imported so that they may be classified, and will there be a detailed declaration or something of that sort to enable the department at the end of the year to give statistics covering the different classifications, in regard to food and clothing, for instance?

Mr. DUNNING: That is what is contemplated. So far nine different groupings are being worked out to give the information required. It is impossible to make it applicable to every individual item of the tariff, but so far as groupings can be arranged to give information upon which judgment can be exercised as to the manner in which the arrangement is working, that is being done now.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. STEWART: And the returning tourist will have to make a declaration more or less in detail.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. WHITE: The returning tourist will make his declaration to the frontier officer, who will note the kind and value of the goods declared to him and make a return to the customs house which he serves, and for statistical purposes this information must be compiled.

Mr. DUNNING: That is right.

Mr. LAWSON: Under paragraph (a) of the item with respect to travellers' baggage, under regulations to be prescribed by the minister, are there regulations now in existence or are these regulations still to be prescribed? In either event, is the \$100 covered by paragraph (b) of the item in addition to that prescribed by regulations under paragraph (a)?

Mr. DUNNING: The (a) item appeared only because of the redrafting of the whole item consequent on the inclusion of (b). There is no difference at all in the treatment accorded under what is described as (a). It is already in the tariff and is being administered under regulations which have been in existence for a considerable time, and there is no change in what is contemplated under (b).

Mr. LAWSON: With respect to (b), goods valued at not more than \$100, included in the baggage accompanying residents of Canada returning from abroad, does that mean that each member of a family returning may bring back a maximum of \$100 worth, assuming that they are all returning together?

Mr. DUNNING: That is correct, but they cannot pool it. If my hon. friend has a large family, he could not take them all over and buy a car and pool the \$100 for each member of the family.

Mr. LAWSON: There is something else to which I would call attention. Under the last proviso clause limiting the quantities or values of particular goods that may be brought in, there is a provision that exemption shall not be allowed on alcoholic beverages in excess of one quart. Is it not now illegal, by the law of every province of Canada, for a private individual to import alcoholic beverages? If so, I want to suggest something in that connection.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct. Under the provincial laws it is illegal for an individual to have in his possession liquor other than that purchased from a liquor commission.