

This is to make the item easier of administration. It was never intended that there should be a seventy-five cent duty on sweet potatoes coming into this country. The tariff passed last session imposed that duty and as the item read, it would include sweet potatoes. This merely differentiates between the two.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Sir George Perley that item 83, as contained in resolution No. 3 of September 16, 1930, be amended to read:

Potatoes, as hereunder defined:
(a) in their natural state, per 100 pounds: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, 75 cents.

(b) dried, desiccated, or dehydrated, per pound: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, 2½ cents.

(c) sweet potatoes, in their natural state, per 100 pounds: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 10 cents; general tariff, 15 cents.

(d) sweet potatoes, n.o.p. per pound: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 1½ cents; general tariff, 2½ cents.

Amendment agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

4. Resolved, that schedule B to the customs tariff, being chapter forty-four of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, as amended by chapter seventeen of the acts of 1928, chapter thirty-nine of the acts of 1929 and chapter thirteen of the acts of 1930, be further amended by striking thereout tariff items 1040, 1041, 1056, 1060 and 1065.

Mr. BENNETT: We now come to schedule B which deals with the deleted drawback items. It is proposed to strike out from resolution 4, item 1065. It has no application this year, because this year's operations are completed, and in the winter there will be no importations by water under it. The matter will then be disposed of. As the subsequent section permits deliveries until the first day of December, there will be no application of this item, and therefore it has been withdrawn.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY moved:

That resolution No. 4 of September 16, 1930, be amended by striking out therefrom tariff item 1065.

Mr. RALSTON: That is coal used in the manufacture of salt.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman will see, in view of the conclusion reached to extend the exemption of the operation of the new items to contracts already existing, it will be only a matter of adding greatly to departmental activities if this item is carried as it stands, because it is proposed that goods

have to be delivered by the 1st December to claim the benefit of exemption, and inasmuch as navigation is closed by that time, this is so dealt with to prevent confusion.

Mr. RALSTON: There is no eastern coal used in those plants?

Mr. BENNETT: I believe in no substantial quantity. I believe Belleville is the furthest point west reached, and there is no salt there. There is another amendment to be moved by the hon. member for Argenteuil to meet the situation mentioned by the hon. member for North Waterloo and several other hon. members. The proposed amendment reads:

Provided, that any such enactment shall not apply to goods bona fide purchased and imported, but not entered, on or before the sixteenth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and thirty, nor to goods imported and in warehouse on or before that date, provided such goods are taken out of warehouse on or before the thirtieth day of November, one thousand nine hundred and thirty, nor to goods imported, under regulations prescribed by the minister, on or before the thirtieth day of November, one thousand nine hundred and thirty, when such goods have been bona fide contracted for and purchased in the country of export prior to the aforesaid sixteenth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and thirty.

I think that is as broad as it can reasonably be made to meet the situation presented by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EULER: I think that would be satisfactory, except that in some lines contracts are made very far ahead.

Mr. BENNETT: The amendment says, prior to the 16th of September.

Mr. EULER: But I understood that there was some termination.

Mr. BENNETT: The termination is the 30th of November. In practice it has been found absolutely essential, I am told by the officers, to have some definite date with respect to matters of this kind.

Mr. EULER: In the case I had in mind the contracts were made, I think, for six months ahead, and I am not sure that the amendment would meet the requirements.

Mr. BENNETT: I may say that another case came up in connection with machinery under contract, part of which had been delivered. It must be obvious that you could not cover cases where the delivery of the balance of a contract would not take place until some time next year. That would have to be dealt with under the provisions with respect to partly completed contracts.

[Mr. Bennett.]