

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know whether bowling balls used in bowling alleys are made in the United Kingdom. From the United Kingdom there is a substantial import of balls under the heading of sporting equipment, but whether they are bowling balls or not I do not know. My hon. friend has made a tremendous point, and this is one of the cases to which I referred in my first statement with regard to this policy, namely, that inevitably some hardship must be caused to somebody. You cannot put in a policy of this kind in a painless fashion; somebody has to be hurt to a certain extent.

This is a concern which is owned, it is true, to the extent of 50 per cent by a veteran and 50 per cent by a non-veteran, and it was not in this business before June. It was bad luck, if I may say so, to get into the business after June 30, but no one knows better than my hon. friend, who is a distinguished lawyer, that hard cases make bad law, and I am not going to take as a typical example the case of one firm which cannot import bowling balls from the United States, which are prohibited and, I believe, under existing conditions properly prohibited. I cannot take this as an outstanding example of the foolishness and unsoundness of this prohibitory legislation. If the concern were owned 100 per cent by the veteran, there would be a special quota assigned to him; but it is not possible for me or for the administration to look into every case where there is joint ownership between a veteran and a non-veteran to find out whether it is a case where the non-veteran along with the veteran should get a special privilege.

I am told that this case, partly no doubt as a result of representations made by the hon. member for Calgary West, was carefully and sympathetically considered by the officials of the department, and the decision which was taken was one which it was felt was necessary if we were to maintain any semblance of principle in the administration of an admittedly difficult law.

The refrigeration matter raised by my hon. friend is, of course, a matter of the tax, which is under the amendments to the Special War Revenue Act and will come up later.

As regards the Calgary stampede, the stampede has certainly taken its place as the greatest show on earth and I agree that it is a great producer of United States dollars.

The reason fireworks were dropped from the prohibited list is that a considerable proportion of these do come from the sterling area countries, and that is one case where it was found possible to drop goods from the prohibited list.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask a supplementary question?

The CHAIRMAN: If the bowling alley case has been completed, I should like to make a few observations.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask one general question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Is it the rule of the department that, when one seeks special consideration, the business must be wholly owned, 100 per cent, by a veteran?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is the case unless it is an incorporated company where, of necessity, there must be legal qualifying shares held by two other directors, or whatever they may be. It is a special exception; it is a special privilege given to the veteran as a veteran.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I realize that. I am happy about it and am very much in favour of it. But let us take as an example, for instance, a young veteran like the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) here. We will say that he has now returned from his fifth war or something like that.

Mr. ABBOTT: It cannot be that bad.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): And we will say that he, being a poor man, has got together \$10,000 and is going to form a radiator company or something like that. I have heard that he has been in the radiator business, not the radio business. We will suppose that he, having raised that money, gets hold of a plant and borrows \$5,000 from a person who is not a veteran and who has a security on his business. Is that company or partnership which it may be, an enterprise wholly owned by a veteran, or is it not? If it is regarded as one that is wholly owned by a veteran, how in the world do you distinguish between two partners, one a veteran and one not a veteran; because in the case which I have mentioned if the thing does not go, the mortgagee, not the veteran, will ultimately own the whole business? A mortgage in that case is really ownership. What is your ruling there?

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend says that a mortgage is really ownership. Some test must be established, and the test is whether the business is owned by the veteran. That does not preclude a veteran who owns a business from borrowing money from his bank, from a private individual or from anywhere else he likes.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): With security on the property?