

cannot stop them, but I think the minister should find some way of warning the people. The hon. member for Mount Royal suggested that this might be done by inserting certain words in this item, but I fancy that might be difficult. I think however the government should take steps to make it clear to the people of Canada that this is not an authority to bring whisky into a province where there is a provincial law against that procedure.

Mr. DUNNING: The right hon. gentleman has approached the matter from the practical standpoint. In endeavouring to do the same may I point out that the government is not simply being stubborn in the matter. This has been the subject of discussion and investigation since the note was first written to the United States, at the conclusion of the negotiation of the treaty. Also since the budget was brought down on May 1, now nearly a month ago, the actual wording has been in review, because it is generally known that the provision is of an experimental nature. As has been indicated, to a certain extent it will have to be dealt with by regulation, and we acknowledge there is a difficulty inherent in the feature mentioned by my right hon. friend and by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. The Minister of National Revenue is making arrangements to see to it that tourists are advised. Methods may vary from time to time, according to experience, but we do want to give this provision a trial under the present wording, because of the way in which that wording has been worked out and the consultations which have taken place in various quarters in regard to it. It is not, of course, like the laws of the Medes and Persians.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Would the government be in a position to make a change next session, if it were thought wise to do so?

Mr. DUNNING: Quite.

Mr. CAHAN: Would the minister give me the citation from the Importation of Intoxicating Liquors Act?

Mr. ILSLEY: I was going to give it to the hon. member. I would refer him to chapter 31 of the statutes of 1928, and particularly to section 2(a), the interpretation clause.

Mr. BARBER: I understand that a tourist arriving at a port of entry with \$100 worth of goods is given exemption to the value of \$100. He then cannot secure a further exemption for a period of four months. What about the tourist who arrives at a port with only \$10

worth of goods? Should he receive another exemption within a period of four months? Does the provision refer to an exemption of \$100 within four months?

Mr. DUNNING: There is no carry-over.

Mr. BARBER: That encourages the tourist to come back with \$100 worth of goods.

Mr. DUNNING: I suppose you might put it that way, yes.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—802. Materials and parts as hereunder specified, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols, sunshades, walking sticks or canes, under such regulations as the minister may prescribe, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories:—

(a) Mounts, sticks, rods, ribs, runners, rings, caps, notches, tips, ferrules and assembled frames: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

(b) Umbrella-covering fabrics of a kind not made in Canada, whether or not specially treated but not further manufactured than with hemmed selvages, when imported in lengths of not less than ten yards each, with or without natural selvages: British preferential tariff, free; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to direct a question to the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: I have an amendment to move which may clarify the discussion at least in some degree. It will be noticed that previously materials for the manufacture of umbrellas were scattered through three items bearing widely differing rates. In drafting the item an effort was made to arrive at a fair rate applicable to all, but representations have been made since that time indicating that formerly a much larger proportion of the (a) section in the item came in under a 5 per cent intermediate tariff than came in under other items carrying a higher rate. It has been contended that the concessions granted on cloths and on portions of the frame would be to a greater or lesser extent offset by the increase in the rate on the components of the frame. That was not intended, of course. The intention was to help with respect to materials entering into the manufacture of umbrellas. The amending resolution which I shall ask my colleague to move changes to 5 per cent the rate of 10 per cent under the intermediate rate in section (a).

Mr. ILSLEY: I move:

That the rates of duties of customs set opposite tariff item 802(a) as introduced under resolution No. 5 on May 1, 1936, be amended to read as follows: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 5 per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Amendment agreed to.