

that as a result of this arrangement we would be able to import into Canada through Canadian seaports, and export to the West Indies through our seaports, the products of both countries under conditions which would be more favourable than they have been hitherto. There will be great disappointment if it is found that no preference is shown to Canadian seaports. Having looked at this section and other sections of the Bill, I am quite sure the hon. minister would make more substantial progress if, in regard to the legal effect of some of the questions that have been raised or may be raised, the Minister of Justice were consulted about the matter, because the Bill has not been drafted with that care which should be given to a measure of this importance. I am satisfied that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce would make greater progress if he would allow it to lie over for a little and come back and speak on those points that have been raised.

Mr. CLARK: I have not left my seat for one minute while this Bill has been in Committee, and I rise now to endorse the appeal which has been made to the hon. minister by my hon. friends from Pictou and South Wellington. I must say there seems to be very great ambiguity in this Bill. I am not a lawyer, but very little has been made clear so far as my humble capacity has permitted me to follow the discussion, and I have followed it very carefully. My hon. friend the minister did not seem to be clear about the word 'direct,' and I am not clear as to whether the four-fifths of the duties are to be reckoned according to the duties collected against French goods or against United States goods. Then there was a point raised as to whether the duties collected under subsection (d) were contingent on the British preference. We have had no declaration of the policy or standing of this Ministry in regard to British preference. This Bill is to stand for ten years, but it will not stand as it is now if the British preference is to be altered. At any moment commercial dealings affected by this Bill may be thrown into confusion by an alteration of the British preference. The only clear point that has been brought home to me in the Committee was that referred to by my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin). I must say that he has made that one point perfectly clear, and I think it is one that should be made clear to the people of this country. This is the first time I have assisted in Committee such a preferential Bill, or tried to study empire-building from this point of view. Before the recess my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave my hon. friend the assurance that the farmers in Wright county

Mr. MACDONALD.

would be able to get certain of their produce into the West Indies under this treaty more easily than they have hitherto, hay for example. Since the recess, my hon. friend has made it equally clear that cocoa will come into this country with more difficulty. So there is one thing clear to me, and I repeat, I hope it will be made clear to the people of this country, that under this Bill, preferential empire-building means that West Indian horses will get hay more easily by Canadian human beings getting cocoa with more difficulty. As I do not want to get my cocoa with any greater difficulty for the sake of the West Indian horses, I the more readily and more emphatically endorse the appeal which has been made by my two hon. friends, that we should let this thing stand, and that the minister, who looks very tired, and others should take some fresh air and be better able later on to clear up the points other than this one which has been made perfectly clear.

Mr. DEVLIN: May I ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce why he did not follow the procedure adopted in 1907 when the Parliament of Canada ratified the treaty between Canada and Japan? There could not possibly be any conflict of opinion as to the interpretation of that Act, there could not be any conflict of opinion between the law passed by this Parliament and the treaty itself, because under the Act 6 and 7 Edward VII, chap. 50, the very simple procedure followed was to have two clauses, the first 'that this Act may be cited as the Japanese Treaty Act of 1906,' and secondly, 'the Convention of the 31st day of January 1906, which is set forth in the schedule of this Act is hereby sanctioned.' That would have covered the whole point, and I do not think my hon. friend the minister would have had to go into all the explanations that he has given of the different clauses of this Bill if he had followed out that procedure. He would certainly have obtained exactly what apparently he seeks to obtain, the ratification of the treaty purely and simply.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have some sympathy with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce because there have been times when I thought I had bright ideas in my head but when the lawyers got through fixing up the Bill containing them, it did not seem to be what I meant at all. I think that if instead of replying to us in the way he did to-night, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice had taken this Bill and whipped it into shape, and, as head of the legal department of the Government had become responsible for its accuracy, we