

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid my hon. friend does not appreciate my point. My point is this: We will say that a merchant last year was withdrawing in the month of August goods to the value of a thousand dollars a day. This year, after the 7th or 8th of August, he commenced to withdraw \$2,000 or \$3,000 worth a day. Supposing he has withdrawn \$3,000 worth a day, would he be expected to pay the extra duty on the thousand dollars worth which represented the business which he had ordinarily carried on?

Mr. WHITE: That depends on the sales made. My view would be that if \$1,000 a day represented his ordinary sales he should not be charged upon that, and it is quite possible that he should not be charged on all the excess. It might be that some of his customers, more astute than himself, had ordered a larger amount than usual, and he might have in good faith filled that order. It is a question of fact that the customs officers will have to look into, and in regard to which they will have to make such recommendations as they deem proper and fit to do justice in the situation.

Mr. CARVELL: It is giving pretty broad power, I must confess, to the department. The Postmaster General made the statement, which we know is true, that the duty had not been paid in this case. How would the Audit Act be of any assistance?

Mr. WHITE: They would have to pay it.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, I see; they would have to pay it and then it would be refunded.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the minister give us the totals of his expectations of revenue from these increases?

Mr. WHITE: The memorandum which I have prepared and which I think my hon. friend asks for, is as follows: From the customs I would expect to derive for the year, based upon the importations of last year, the sum of \$8,706,672.73. Deduct from that five-twelfths, because five months of the year have already elapsed, \$3,627,780.30, leaving for the remainder of the year \$5,078,892.43. I have deducted from that one-third, for the reason I gave yesterday, namely, that it is probable that we shall have a slight decline in importations due to the war. Whether that one-third is measurable accurately or not I am unable to say. If we take off one-third, it leaves the revenue for the balance of the

year as \$3,385,928.29. On excise, the increased duties will give us a revenue for the year, based upon the commodities taken out of bond last year, of \$6,600,514.29. Deducting from that five-twelfths, or \$2,750,214.29, we get for the remainder of the year \$3,850,300, which makes a total additional revenue for the seven months of \$7,236,228.29. The House will recall that for the balance of the year I said I would raise \$7,000,000. The House will observe from this statement that the increase in customs and excise for the year based upon last year's experience would be about \$15,000,000, but the amount which we shall derive for the year commencing with this date will not be as large by reason of the decrease in importations which we anticipate.

Mr. MACDONALD: I assume that this covers all that the Government propose to offer this session in the way of the propositions relating to the raising of revenue with the exception of excise duties.

Mr. WHITE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like, not in the spirit of any captious criticism, to point out again, because I would not want to be regarded as absolutely agreeing with the details of this proposal, that in view of the situation in this country, of which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance takes a very optimistic view, I do not think the Government has paid special attention to the exact condition of industry in this country in framing this method of raising taxes. We are all aware of the condition that existed in Canada previous to the declaration of war. Every one who knows anything about business conditions in this country must realize—and I do not see why we should not say so frankly—that the war came at a most inopportune time for Canada in so far as our business conditions are concerned. From my hon. friend's standpoint, when he came to deal with the question of amending the tariff, it seems to me he should have taken into consideration the question of whether or not he might not have dealt specifically with some of the cases where our importations from other countries will continue and the Canadian workmen will be out of employment. I fail to see that in any of these changes which the minister has proposed that he has done anything for the Canadian workmen. I want to warn him—I think it is only right, here assembled as we are under these peculiar circumstances and having regard to the serious condition of the coun-