

Treaty. The almost invariable rule is that treaties do not contain any such provision, but they do contain a provision providing for ratification, and the Treaty becomes effective and binding on the nation concerned when it is ratified, and not until it is ratified. The method of ratification for each country depends upon its own constitution, and upon its own constitution and the attitude of the government depends whether the Treaty is submitted to the legislative assembly or parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is not the King the only one with authority to ratify the Treaty? Parliament may approve it, but is not ratification the act of the Sovereign?

Mr. ROWELL: In the British Empire it is the act of the Sovereign; in the United States it is the act of the President and the Senate.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is not the logical sequence of that answer, that we have no rights whatever in this matter, if it is the King that ratifies for the British Empire?

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. DEVLIN: We are assuming, of course, that this extraordinary course is due to some emergency.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. member that there is nothing extraordinary in the course taken. The house may decide to give third reading at once to any Bill which has not been amended in Committee and which is not a Money Bill.

Mr. DEVLIN: I bow to your ruling, Sir, but it has been the practice of this House that the third reading is given by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unanimous consent is only required for the exceptions mentioned.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed, from March 26, consideration in Committee of Bill No. 12, respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons and the Electoral Franchise.—Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 12—conveyance of electors to polls, etc., for hire forbidden.

Mr. GAUVREAU: In justice to the translators, may I be allowed to say a few words in connection with Clause 2?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can refer to Clause 2 only by unanimous consent of the Committee.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Then I would ask the House to give me an opportunity to say something on behalf of the translators.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the unanimous wish of the Committee that the hon. member have leave to revert to Clause 2?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I am afraid that, while discussing Clause 2 of the Bill I did not do adequate justice to the translators. If you refer to the English version of the Bill you will see that the subsections are enumerated alphabetically, and when the translation was made the translators desired to follow the same course, but this was not done. Afterwards the French version was also made alphabetical. This is the reason why, at first, there did not seem to be any concordance between the English and the French versions. I desire to place this explanation before the Committee, and particularly to bring it to the attention of the minister so that the translators may be free from reproach in the discharge of their duty.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause 12 carry?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is understood that we are to take up only non-controversial clauses this evening.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is correct.

Mr. MCKENZIE: Is Clause 12 the same as the old law?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Clause 12 is an adaptation of Clauses 270 and 271 of the former Act. There is a little change in the language, but speaking generally I think the meaning is practically the same.

Mr. MORPHY: This is to my mind a clause more honoured in the breach than in the observance. It is a time-honoured clause which has tended more or less to bring about the very thing which it aims to correct, namely, corruption in the dealings of candidates with voters in their conveyance to the poll. I do not suppose that there is an hon. gentleman in this House who has had experience in election matters but who will agree with me that this particular clause carries with it the very