

effect by order in council and later submitted to parliament. The intention, so far as I know, is to bring this into effect on January 1 and then as the whole agreement presumably would be submitted to parliament along with all the schedules of tariff changes.

Hon. Mr. McKEEN: In each case it has been the succeeding parliament that has dealt with it if any change was made.

Mr. McKINNON: That is right, the succeeding session.

Hon. Mr. KING: Under the Customs tariff a change in the tariff may be made by order in council?

Mr. McKINNON: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. KING: And that has been so for years?

Mr. McKINNON: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think we can say that the change would remain in effect so long as it was not disapproved by parliament.

Hon. Mr. KING: That would of course be so.

The CHAIRMAN: Supposing parliament did not deal with it at all, would it still remain in effect?

Mr. McKINNON: There is nothing in the statutory legislation as to the length of time a tariff change made by order in council may remain in effect.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: If parliament rejects an order in council it becomes null and void, does it not? That would seem to be common sense.

The CHAIRMAN: Legal sense and common sense are different things.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that for many years it has been the law that any Canadian government can reduce duties by order in council, but cannot increase them.

Mr. McKINNON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Any increase that is made must be approved by parliament. If any change made by the government is challenged in parliament, the government has to stand or fall by what parliament decides.

Mr. McKINNON: I think that is quite right, Senator Crerar, that in the past these things have been done provisionally by orders in council, which in due course have been submitted to parliament for approval.

The CHAIRMAN: But there is no need to ask parliament to approve of a reduction in the tariff, because the government has power to make a reduction by order in council.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: In the past, tariff changes have been dealt with in the budget.

Mr. McKINNON: In the past, sir, when there was any agreement such as we are considering now there was a separate resolution in the house and a separate bill, apart altogether from the budget.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: I have a question which I think is very pertinent, but there may be some political implications to it, and if so I will not press it. Without prejudicing what was done at Geneva would it have been possible, say at the beginning of 1946, to have negotiated with United States some or all of the advantages that are included in this agreement? It seems to me that the movement that was made at Geneva towards facilitating international trade was initiated by the United States in December, 1945.

Mr. McKINNON: That is right.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: That is, the idea of a multilateral treaty affecting the trade of the world. Would it have prejudiced the outcome so far as Canada is