

this evening, that is, that they were studying this pig industry. Therefore that pig industry was segregated and put into one article. It matters not what the opinion of my legal friends is as to the drafting of the article, there is no doubt in my mind as to the good faith or the intention of the British government or what they will do in carrying out that intention. The article indicates specifically and in simple language—it may not be in the best legal terminology, but it is in terms that can be clearly understood—that the intention is to ensure to Canada during the period of this agreement the free entry of Canadian bacon and hams into the British market. It is quite true that the British government may, during that period of five years, vary its legislation of a restrictive character against foreign bacon and hams, but it is equally certain that Canadian bacon and hams are ensured during the life of the agreement free entry into the British market. There is no question whatever on that point. The right hon. gentleman suggests that this should have been stated in the article itself. With all due deference, and not posing in any sense as a lawyer, I submit that the fact that the agreement is to remain in force for a period of five years, and that this is an integral part of the agreement, the five year period is not only implied but ensured in this article.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope the minister is right, but I should like him to make a direct inquiry of the British government and ascertain whether that is their interpretation. I do not think anyone could possibly place that interpretation upon the agreement as it is drafted. The minister has quoted section 22 as authority for the statement that this shall continue for five years. Section 22 says that the agreement shall come into force from the date of the signing of the agreement, and it was signed on August 20, yet no special quota provision applies at the moment. Section 22 has reference to the length of the term of the agreement. Article 7 contains a special provision with respect to tobacco legislation extending over a period of ten years; it is part of the agreement, but the period of time during which the provision shall be effective is longer. If the agreement for a five year period is to be read subject to the terms of each section, why should some sections limit the term of importation to three years, others limit it to five years, and others provide no time limit at all? I submit that under this section the British government at any of the sessions of parliament could levy a duty on hog products entering the British

market, and no exception could be taken to their doing so. I venture the prophecy that if this protectionist policy becomes at all general, long before the period of five years has expired you will find any number of duties levied by Great Britain against the dominions in relation to agricultural products.

Mr. STEVENS: The right hon. gentleman has answered himself by citing article 22. He cites the coming into effect of this agreement, which is now:

Subject to the necessary legislative or other action being taken as soon as may be practicable hereafter.

Surely we are not going to quibble over this. All though the agreement there are on the part of both parties certain legislative acts that must be taken to give effect to it. We have just passed two or three articles dealing with very important matters in connection with the cattle embargo. The British government have to take certain actions to make the undertaking effective. They have taken those actions. So we find all through the agreement that legislative action must be taken, and with all due respect for my right hon. friend's long experience in these matters, I submit to him that the point he makes is well covered. I submit that the British government could not without violating the terms of this agreement impose restrictions upon Canadian produced bacon which are not imposed equally upon the home grown product during the life of the agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister can remove all doubt if he will cable the Minister of Agriculture in Great Britain and inquire whether that is the interpretation of the British government. I think in the interests of the Canadian hog producers we have the right to that assurance. I cannot imagine the hog producers in this country having any greater ground for grievance than would be occasioned by their being encouraged to go into this business on the assumption that a market in Great Britain is guaranteed to them for five years, and the British government subsequently pointing out that it suits their purposes to impose a duty on hog products although there was no mention of it in the agreement, and it was expressly so stated in the Canadian House of Commons, and the Canadian minister of that day would not take the trouble to obtain the assurance asked for. I ask the minister now to get that assurance. I have another request to make. I do not say that we should hold up this article to examine the report of the British commission, but it ought to be tabled at once