

Excise Act

Mr. BENNETT: It is left now to the imagination and good will of the officials.

Section agreed to.

Sections 27 and 28 agreed to.

On section 29—Warehousing and ex-warehousing of tobacco and cigars.

Mr. ILSLEY: This amendment just takes out the reference to raw leaf tobacco.

Section agreed to.

Section 30 agreed to.

On section 31—Sections 275 to 283, both inclusive, and 292 to 294, both inclusive, repealed.

Mr. STEWART: Would the minister be good enough to explain just why this section is here? I have not read the act.

Mr. ILSLEY: All these sections which are being repealed relate to foreign raw leaf tobacco, which is not now to be dealt with by the Excise Act at all because it is dutiable under the customs tariff and is subject to the provisions of the Customs Act. Formerly the Excise Act governed it, but now the Customs Act governs it.

Mr. STEWART: So these sections are really a duplication now?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 32.

Mr. STEWART: The note on section 32 says:

The paragraph designation "(a)" as it presently appears in subsection 1 of section 296 is improperly placed, and the amendment simply moves it to its proper place in the subsection.

The amendment simply moves it to its proper place?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes; there is no change in the wording.

Section agreed to.

On section 33—Unlawful removal of tobacco or cigars.

Mr. ILSLEY: This makes it an offence to permit or allow the removal of tobacco or cigars.

Mr. STEWART: What is the difference in the penalty?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is not to be mandatory in the future, but there is to be an option of fine or imprisonment. In the past both fine and imprisonment were mandatory.

Mr. STEWART: But "and" is read "or" sometimes.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

Mr. ILSLEY: It could not be in this case. It is either a fine or imprisonment. In the past it has been both fine and imprisonment. This is more lenient.

Section agreed to.

On section 34—Coming into force of sections 20 to 31.

Mr. STEWART: Is this just to get it into the fiscal year? I see the note says:

It is not proposed to bring the sections referred to into operation until the commencement of the fiscal year 1939-1940.

Mr. ILSLEY: The reason for delaying the coming into force of the section is because the regulations are being worked out. A great deal of work on the regulations is necessary, and has not been completed. Probably it will not be fully completed until next spring. It is for that reason it is asked that the sections shall not become effective until April 1, 1939.

Mr. STEWART: I suppose any of the old labels or materials complying with the existing act could be used up in that period of time.

Mr. ILSLEY: That would be possible, yes; but it is not the purpose of the delay. I suppose it would be necessary to make some such provision in the regulations, and the delay enables that to be done.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY

VALIDITY OF QUEBEC STATUTE—STATEMENT OF MR. WOODSWORTH ON MOTION OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I should like to call the attention of the house to a serious situation arising out of the enactment of the so-called padlock law, properly entitled, "An act to protect the province against communistic propaganda."

Shortly after the bill was passed last year by the Quebec legislature—

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would permit me, I should like to call his attention to one or two points. I do not know whether a point of order should be raised, but I think a discussion of this matter is at least of doubtful order at this time.