

in connection with very many items of the tariff. It is frequently necessary for the department to rely upon a declaration with respect to the use of a particular article. If one refers to the verbatim transcript of the evidence taken by the board it becomes clear that none of the articles mentioned in this list is made in Canada. Even the accessories mentioned are not of a type manufactured in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that so with respect to all of them?

Mr. DUNNING: I understand so, yes. The Canadian manufacturers of the commodities mentioned in the application did not oppose the granting of this concession. What might be called the opposing elements came to an agreement on the general principles involved. They went into conference and actually agreed on the items.

Mr. BENNETT: Does that include everyone in the trade?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, well, I have nothing further to say if that includes the small interests—the druggist, for instance, who sells the supplies.

Mr. DUNNING: No—the manufacturers of the articles.

Mr. BENNETT: I am inquiring whether the consumer was consulted or not.

Mr. DUNNING: The consumer in this instance is the professional photographer. The professional photographer and the manufacturers of photographic supplies went into conference. I am free to say that I share somewhat the fear that the customs department may have difficulty with it. They are content, following a review of the evidence and the conclusions of the tariff board, to endeavour to administer the item, and we shall watch whether some change may be necessary as a result of experience. For the present we think this is a concession to the photographic industry that we can very well make in connection at any rate with that portion of their professional equipment which is not made in Canada.

Mr. STIRLING: Under the previous items where did the material largely come from which is covered by this new wording?

Mr. BENNETT: Rochester.

Mr. DUNNING: Well, more largely from the United States and Germany than anywhere else, although it was distributed over so many items of the tariff that it was difficult to trace with any accuracy.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. BENNETT: Eastman's, of course, are the great kodak people of the world. To some extent they are rivalled by Germans. I thought they had a small plant at Toronto.

Mr. DUNNING: Not for manufacturing professional size cameras; just for the smaller ones.

Mr. STEVENS: In the schedules that we have before us as they appear in the votes and proceedings the old rates are indicated in the three columns to the right, and there I find five items referred to. Am I correct in assuming that those items are repealed and are now incorporated in item 462a?

Mr. DUNNING: No; the numbers of the old items, my hon. friend will note, are at the end. This is a case where previously the particular equipment in question was not separately classified for tariff purposes, but parts of it were contained within the items referred to by my hon. friend, and the effect of the item is to extract from the items so numbered the articles mentioned in this one. It has extracted a part from each of the ones mentioned.

Mr. STEVENS: I notice that items 288 and 427 are repealed.

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, they are, in this resolution that precedes it. The whole item is repealed.

Mr. DUNNING: There is an explanation of that.

Mr. STEVENS: The fact is that these items are repealed. At the moment I am not asking for an explanation—I will give the minister an opportunity of making one. But the fact that they are repealed is, I think, established by the resolution which we adopted or which we are now in process of considering. It will be noticed that item 288, for instance, is here referred to; the item we are considering, namely 462a, deals with photographic cameras, equipment, and so forth, and as far as I can see there is no reference in it to earthenware and stoneware, etc. Item 288 covers "earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured and Rockingham ware; 'C.C.' or cream-coloured ware, decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware, n.o.p." This item is repealed, yet we see it is referred to here as in part going into this item. I will cite one or two more. The next item 427, also repealed, reads as follows:

All machinery composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, n.o.p., and complete parts thereof.