

ton, at their end. It is an undertaking on the part of each party that they will listen sympathetically to any representations made by the other party.

Mr. HARRIS: But in matters of consultation of this kind the essential element of time creeps in. I am thinking of another agreement passed in 1932 in connection with which representations have been made in the past, and the minister will have in mind probably what I am thinking of. Just now I am thinking of the great difficulties that Canada is going to get into during the lifetime of this three-year agreement. Will this organization take two or three years, or is there any way of speeding it up? I put this on record in *Hansard* so that reference may be made to it. The minister will probably agree that the administration of matters of this kind is something like the administration of justice—you get it eventually. I did not know whether the minister would like, from his seat, to enlarge upon the routine that would be followed, so that when we have to do it we may do it with some expedition.

Mr. DUNNING: You can always agree to consult with anybody, but you cannot decide how long it is going to take the two parties who consult to agree. This merely provides amicable machinery for consultation, but it does not guarantee agreement. In the instance to which my hon. friend refers, which was so unfortunate, in connection with the trade treaty known as the Ottawa agreements of 1932, there was no lack of facilities for consultation and communication, but there was distinctly a lack of agreement.

Mr. HARRIS: Would this have the same effect as article XVIII, as I recall it, of the 1932 agreement?

Mr. DUNNING: It is not exactly the same wording.

Mr. McNEVIN: Could dumping be considered under this provision?

Mr. DUNNING: No, that is covered by Canadian law.

Mr. BROOKS: Would bonuses be considered under this item?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, anything of that kind of which either country complains could result in representations under section 1 of Article XV.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Under which article does Canada undertake to remove the excise tax?

Mr. DUNNING: We have already passed that as the head-note to schedule I, at the top of page 13.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. HARRIS: The provision here is for "a committee of technical experts on which each government will be represented to consider the matter and to submit recommendations to the two governments." I imagine this would cover such things as products being shipped into this country in jute packages where the jute might be second-hand, and such like. Has the minister in his docket a note upon which he might enlarge and tell us who the technical experts on this committee are likely to be? Will they be officers within the departments or people drawn from scientific organizations?

Mr. DUNNING: It has not been necessary to invoke the provision as yet, but each country, I think, would decide for itself.

Mr. HARRIS: Countries that have trouble with the foot-and-mouth disease—I am not referring to the United States at the moment—cannot ship goods to this country except under certain regulations. That applies to Scotland at the present time, and it has always been a question as to how judgment shall be given, particularly in the matter of animal products of all kinds; so much so that it has been necessary to send from London, England, to places like Scotland, a special representative of the dominion government to examine the product and give a certificate that the goods are of a class or kind that might be approved and sent through to Canada. The entire plant where the goods are being manufactured is inspected and checked by an official of this dominion government, who is sent at the expense of this government from London to Scotland to examine the entire plant, and a certificate is required from this dominion official that the goods are such as might be shipped in here without let or hindrance. The question I wish to ask is whether the technical experts, in the case of shipments from the United Kingdom, will be from the high commissioners' office. Whether or not they are qualified to pass judgment is another matter.

Mr. DUNNING: I would point out that there is no such provision in the United Kingdom agreement as is contained in section 3 of article XV of this treaty.

Mr. HARRIS: But this is a particular provision now being made. I come back to my question: Who would the technical experts be?

Mr. DUNNING: Each government would be responsible for appointing its own to deal with the particular case as it arises; but remember the decision of the technical experts is not final. The decision of each government