

*Customs Act*

I should like to know from the minister if this new method of valuation applies to goods which qualify in respect of those two conditions. If this is so I do not think the hon. member for Broadview need have any fear because all this legislation is attempting to do is to prevent unfair practices on the part of exporters in the United States who may try to send into this country goods which are what are known as either end of line or out of season products. This would have the effect of unfair competition for those concerns in Canada who are engaged in the same line of business.

How can the hon. member say that this method of valuation is impractical when it has never been tried in Canada? The fact is that, as applies in respect of all departmental statistics, the decision in this instance has been and is based on a weighted average. I do not see how the hon. member can quarrel with this method of valuing goods imported into Canada. We have the facilities to get the prices.

I would be interested to know however why the bill stipulates a period of six months, and would ask the minister if this provision has been made because of some international arrangement. Why has there not been a provision for, let us say, twelve months?

I have in mind the matter of Christmas toys, which I saw the other day in Quebec. Those toys were manufactured in Germany, and they are now being imported through New York. There is no doubt that during this season the market will be saturated in the United States, and that those toys will be dumped into Canada. At one time of the year they might sell for 25 cents, while at another time the price might be 15 cents, and the minister would have to arrive at a weighted average. Taking only a period of six months we would go back to the month of May.

I think the hon. member for Broadview should have no fear. However, it is clear that what he has been saying is directly in line with what was expressed yesterday afternoon when the two amendments were moved. The fact is that the hon. member and his colleagues want higher tariffs.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Maltais:** Yes, higher tariffs on the importation of goods.

**Mr. Hees:** No. I rise on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Maltais:** You just take your seat.

**The Chairman:** Order.

**Mr. Maltais:** Perhaps I am out of order in speaking about the amendments.

**Mr. Rowe:** The hon. member for Broadview is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Maltais:** If he is doing that, all right. I would point out to him however that if the provision for a valuation on a basis of weighted value were struck out, the bill if enacted without those words would give power to the minister to amend the tariff on all types of goods, if the amendment suggested by my hon. friend's colleague had been accepted yesterday. That is what would have happened.

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Chairman, when I spoke about this matter last Friday I made it quite clear, as indeed every member in this party has done who has spoken in this debate, that the question of tariff is not under discussion. We are discussing a matter—

**The Chairman:** On that very point, may I ask the hon. member to keep in mind the fact that we are not discussing tariffs; we are discussing the first clause in Bill No. 29.

**Mr. Hees:** Yes; I am just clearing my stand in the matter. I have been accused by the hon. member who has just spoken of advocating higher tariffs. That I have never done, and never will do—and neither has any member in my party. We are not talking about higher tariffs; we are talking about a measure which the government should have presented to the house two years ago, when this matter was brought up and explained in great detail. The minister's reply was, "Dumping does not exist". Then, when he made his speech a week ago Monday outlining this provision, he suggested almost word for word what had been told him two years ago. In the meantime thousands upon thousands of Canadian workmen have been laid off because of his negligence at that time.

**Some hon. Members:** No, no.

**An hon. Member:** Stick to the facts.

**Mr. Hees:** I say we are not discussing higher tariffs. I say higher tariffs are not needed in this instance; it is just a matter of applying a proper anti-dumping regulation.

**The Chairman:** Order. Will the hon. member please confine his remarks to clause 1.

**Mr. Fleming:** What about the hon. member for Charlevoix? He was not called to order.

**Mr. Rowe:** Mr. Chairman, it seems as though everyone has been protesting as to being misunderstood in the remarks they have made. I can understand, Mr. Chairman, that you have a desire to keep the debate close to the subject matter in the section before the committee.