

tion 2 of the agreement the produce or manufacture of these respective colonies imported into Canada would be imported without any reference to the agreement, but subject to the laws and regulations of Canada with respect to tariff matters? I want simply to understand my right hon. friend's contention.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not know that there is any very great advantage in dealing with a case that we do not have before us. The agreement relates to a particular customs duty, and the existing law changed in this respect, and would apply.

Mr. DEVLIN: If the tariff laws must apply, the agreement would only have such effect and force as would be consistent with the tariff laws of Canada, and that being so, section 9 is in contradiction when it says, that the tariff law shall be inconsistent if it is not consistent with your arrangement.

Mr. BORDEN: A clause is very often inserted for greater certainty; but this has quite sufficient application under the first eight clauses of the Bill, without seeking to give it any such application as my hon. friend would.

Mr. LOGGIE: Assuming for argument that Musson & Company of Barbadoes ship a cargo of sugar to their New York branch and place it in a bonded warehouse. If Musson & Company take out one-half of that cargo for United States consumption, according to the law of the United States, and forward the remaining half to Canada, if they were called upon to pay any greater duty on that one-half cargo than if it had been sent originally to Canada, does not the Minister of Trade and Commerce think that the Government of the Barbadoes would consider it a grievance, because by section 50 you limit the ordinary rules of bonding goods?

Mr. LALOR: What objection would there be if they did break bulk and leave half the cargo in the United States and sent half of it to Canada?

Mr. LOGGIE: By section 50, they would not then be entitled to the four-fifths rate of duty. Would not the people of Barbadoes consider that was breaking the terms of the agreement which says that these goods can come into Canada, without the word 'direct' being inserted as it is in this Bill? The treaty refers to goods imported into Canada and that sugar would be imported into Canada, even though it were entered in a bonded warehouse in New York and afterwards sent to Canada.

Mr. BEATTIE: They could ship half of the cargo to Canada and half of the cargo to New York in the first place.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Trade and Commerce seems to be as uncommunicative to-day as he was last evening. A question is put him by the hon. member, who speaks as a business man for the business men of this country who import from the West Indies, and that question is entitled to an answer. The hon. gentleman remains dumb when such an important question is put, and he asks us to pass blindly through this House a Bill which we say alters the terms of a solemn treaty. The only answer given by my hon. friend is, that the gentlemen from the West Indies never thought of raising the question. Perhaps these gentlemen thought that if they raised the question the Minister of Trade and Commerce would consult his expert officers, who would tell him that we could only agree if the goods were brought direct to Canada, and so these astute gentlemen from the West Indies said nothing about it, and they have to-day a trade arrangement under which they are entitled to warehouse their goods in New York or Boston and send them forward to Canadian customers, upon the payment of four-fifths of the regular rate of duty. That right the Minister of Trade and Commerce seeks to take away from them in violation of the terms of the treaty. Does the hon. gentleman think he ought to do that without going back to the West Indian representatives and asking them if they would consent to the terms of the treaty being altered? My hon. friend learning from the Department of Justice that that would be contrary to the privileges which the West Indian colonies enjoy today under the British preference, has drawn a Bill which would alter absolutely the terms of that agreement, and without consulting the representatives of the West Indian colonies he is asking this Parliament to alter the agreement into which he solemnly entered. I do not think we ought to do that. The terms of the agreement are:

This agreement shall be subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada and of the legislature of the above-mentioned colonies.

All that we should do, so far as this treaty is concerned, if we are going to ratify it, is to be delare that we do ratify and approve of it, just as we did in the case of the treaty with Japan. If the treaty does not meet with the approval of this Parliament or of the Minister of Trade and Commerce after he has considered the matter, let him say so and ask Parliament to reject it, and then enter upon negotiations for the purpose of getting the treaty amended in this particular; but do not let him come to Parliament and tell us in one breath that he is asking Parliament to