

they were administered successfully for five months, is surely a practical proof that the wording is reasonably satisfactory in operation.

As to the principle, my views on it are well known. I think there are certain commodities on which the two-way traffic is natural and possible. At certain seasons of the year a commodity may travel north, and at certain other seasons of the year, probably because of climate, it may travel south. In such cases I believe it desirable that we should indicate to our neighbours that we are prepared at all times to bring our tariff rates on such commodities down to the minimum level specified in our tariff, provided they will reciprocate by doing the same thing on the same commodity.

Mr. STEWART: Does the minister not think that the interpretation might be improved to some extent by using the words "is hereby imposed," making it an action of parliament instead of leaving it in the realm of uncertainty and using the words "shall be," which contemplate some action at a future time by some authority competent to impose a duty? The only authority, I submit that is competent to impose a duty is this parliament, either directly, by specifying that duty in the statute in the regular way, which is the open, courageous, manly way to act, or by delegating to the governor in council that power which parliament might exercise. It seems to me that if it is to be contended that the duty is now imposed, it would be well to say "is hereby imposed," or provide, as my leader has said, the authority of the governor in council. What is the objection on the part of the government to putting the matter beyond question, making it absolutely certain, taking to itself the power which it says here exists, which it says is hereby granted? It seems to me that everything points to the desirability of clearing up any uncertainty and of making it beyond question that a duty is legally imposed.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): May I point out to my right hon. friend and to my hon. friend who has just spoken that this parliament, by passing this provision, is imposing duties equivalent to the duties imposed by the foreign country.

Mr. BENNETT: But it says, "shall be imposed."

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): Suppose the clause suggested by my hon. friend who spoke last were adopted: "is hereby imposed" or "are hereby imposed." We would be imposing it before the other country acts.

Mr. BENNETT: But it has acted. That is the trouble.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): If at any time in the future there is imposed upon "goods the produce of the Dominion of Canada duties or charges more onerous than are prescribed by this item, duties equivalent thereto shall be imposed on the like goods."

Mr. CAHAN: By whom?

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): What can it possibly mean except that we would collect from their goods the same duty that they imposed upon ours?

Mr. CAHAN: That is what it means. But who is going to make the imposition?

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): This parliament is making it when it passes this item.

Mr. BENNETT: There is one thing about it. The Postmaster General inclines to the argument that this whole matter is dealing with future proposals. He says that this refers to a country imposing new duties which are in excess of ours.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): Not necessarily.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, that is the way in which it was put a moment ago by my hon. friend.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): If the duty is already imposed, surely this speaks from the present forward. There can be no doubt about what is meant.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, if I were drawing up the provision, I would have said, "any foreign country has imposed or imposes."

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Mr. BENNETT: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the item carried?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BENNETT: Except that we are against it.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—28. Coffee, green, imported direct from the country of growth and production, or purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, per pound: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 3 cents; general tariff, 5 cents.