

That is from the agreement. We cannot change that agreement one iota.

Mr. LALOR: Does not that cover the point at issue? The point was raised by the hon. member for Welland that these goods could be brought into the United States and then exported to Canada. Does that clause not cover it? It says 'On similar goods when imported from any foreign country.' When they are imported from the United States they are imported from a foreign country.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may mean just what my hon. friend says but the agreement is very badly worded if it does. If we are to read it by deduction, as the hon. member for Frontenac said, we may be compelled to say that goods coming from any place where they are manufactured, or goods which are the produce of the West Indies, should come in under this preference because it does not say that they should be imported from the West Indies but only manufactured or produced there. We cannot change that even although it is somewhat bungled without a conference with the West Indies. I do say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that I desire to assist in this Bill and when we find in clause 3 something not in the agreement I would suggest that he refer it to the Justice Department to give him its best legal advice as to the construction of this Act, what ought to be put into it and what left out. My own view is that there should be nothing in this Act but the provisions of the agreement signed by the two countries.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does clause 3 in any way conflict with the agreement in the working of this Act?

Mr. GRAHAM: It might.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman has advanced a very strange doctrine with regard to the making of treaties. There are two classes of treaties—treaties dealing with peace and war and general matters of that kind, and trade treaties. There is a wide distinction between these two classes of treaties. It has always been held in England, where we are supposed to find our model, that Parliament must pass upon a trade treaty and that it has a perfect right to amend that treaty. It has exercised its right to do so. The hon. gentleman says that there cannot be a Bill that modifies or changes a treaty. Why is a treaty presented to Parliament at all for ratification by Parliament unless it is subject to the control of Parliament?

Mr. GRAHAM: It may be rejected.

Mr. CURRIE: As a rule treaties made between Great Britain and other countries are not subject to parliamentary con-

Mr. GRAHAM.

sideration at all. They are simply presented. But a trade treaty is presented to and discussed by Parliament as a matter of business and as a matter that involves supply. If the hon. gentleman can show me any single case or authority for his contention I will be very glad to accept it; otherwise I would strongly advise him to go home and read the matter up.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has given the fullest answer himself against the argument in favour of this Bill. He did not catch what I said or he did not understand it.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman has never read up the matter of trade treaties at all or he would not advance the proposition that he does with regard to this question.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am sorry for my hon. friend's ignorance of the subject but I cannot help it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As the minister has stated that he intends to consider the question as to whether there should be some provision in regard to the goods enumerated in schedule C as also in regards to goods enumerated in schedule B, would it not be reasonable that the Committee should rise and let my hon. friend consider that? As far as I am concerned I think there should be some provision. My hon. friend will see that if schedule C is to be left out altogether then the same argument would apply to schedule B according to our view. Time would be saved if the minister were to allow the Committee to rise and have this matter carefully considered.

Mr. FOSTER: I am very anxious to make some progress with this Bill. We have had a very thorough discussion on section 3, and I do not see that we can make very much change in it. It may be a fair question for discussion as to whether or not anything else should appear in the Bill except approval of the mere wording of the agreement. However, this has not quite the solemnity of a treaty; it is an agreement. I do not say that an agreement should not be observed strictly, but I merely mention that there is a difference between a treaty between sovereign nations and an agreement such as this.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the difference?

Mr. FOSTER: This is not so cast-iron. I do not want to consent to the suggestions made with reference to sub-clause (b) because we have been giving to the West Indian Islands up to the present the benefit of the British preference for fifteen years and they have not been sacrificing anything to give a return for that benefit. It may be they could have gone on for many