

Mr. DUNNING: There is a \$100 exemption.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, of course. I think that there are some very admirable features about the proposed arrangement, and if the minister is correct in saying that this is necessary in order to retain the American agreement, it is all to the good.

Further than that, it seems to me that it will furnish a very valuable lesson in what protection so-called really involves. If the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) is right, that bringing back \$100 worth of goods may in a great many cases cost this country \$30 in revenue, I think that is a splendid bit of education for the public generally. The Canadian people will soon begin to understand how much it costs to live in Canada. They will begin to understand more clearly that, as its name indicates, the tariff is really a tax and a very heavy one, and this tax has been taken from us in the past without our being quite aware of it. Again, if, as the leader of the opposition suggests, half a million people by crossing the border and making their purchases in the United States can escape that tax on the purchase of \$100 or \$400 worth of goods they will soon begin to understand how heavy a tax the tariff has been on each individual and upon each family.

There is another advantage which, it seems to me, may counteract some of the disadvantages. When people come back having saved \$30, we shall say, on a \$100 purchase of goods, they will invest that \$30 in the stores of Hamilton and elsewhere, and our Conservative friends will then begin to realize that there are some advantages in savings to the consumer by getting something like free trade established in this country. I do not know whether my Liberal friends had any sinister motive of putting over an educational campaign of that sort. In any case, I am inclined to think this may be a very good way to teach the people along the border the advantages of freer trade. On the other hand, may I point out a very serious danger in this proposal. It involves discriminatory taxation, or perhaps it would be more correct to say that it involves the discriminatory remission of taxation. If a man has a car or can secure the price of a railroad ticket and has a day or two of leisure, he can cross the border and return with \$100 worth of goods.

Mr. DUNNING: He must have the \$100.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, if he has the \$100. He can bring back \$100 worth of goods if he has the leisure to take the trip. He can

do this four times a year. If he has four or five children he can load them into a car and bring back \$400 or \$500 worth of goods at a time.

Mr. DUNNING: If he has that much money.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so. I want to point out that a great many people have not the necessary \$100 and have to stay at home; a great many people have not a car; a great many people, especially those living in districts remote from the boundary, cannot afford the price of a railroad ticket; then a great many people cannot possibly take advantage of this opportunity as they have not the leisure; they may have steady work and cannot spend several days in taking a trip to the United States. All these people will continue to be taxed and in the long run their taxes will probably be heavier because a few other people are exempted from taxation. It would seem to me that the suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) contains something of merit. He suggested that every resident of Canada should be permitted to obtain \$100 worth of goods free of duty. If a man with a car or the price of a railroad ticket and several days' leisure can do this, why should the same privilege not be given to other residents who have not these things? Why should these people not be permitted to send \$100 orders to mail order houses in the United States? I can conceive that many people, in northern Alberta or Saskatchewan would be very glad to be able to send such an order to a Chicago mail order house.

Mr. COLDWELL: Provided they have the \$100.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That may be true. Anything up to \$100, if you will; say \$10.

Mr. DUNNING: Twenty-five dollars would do just as well.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I was using the maximum; I said up to \$100.

Mr. COLDWELL: Several families could pool together.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, they could do that. I suggest that this privilege is discriminating against those people who most need to have things a little easier. I realize the difficulties, if not the impossibilities in carrying out this suggestion, but there is another way in which it could be done—this amount of taxation could be remitted. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has suggested that the granting of this privilege might easily involve a loss of \$50,000,000 to the