

the minister be good enough to say how the matter was finally settled; whether they dropped the words or amended the clause, and in what form it went through the legislature of the Barbadoes or any of the other colonies affected? I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce might treat the matter with great courtesy and with more seriousness and give a fair answer to the questions which have arisen.

Mr. FOSTER: I have endeavoured to give the reasons and answers requested, but sometimes I group two or three together, as it is easier to get at them in that shape than to answer each one separately, in view of the fact that the same question is asked over and over again. We are now on section 3, and I have given the reasons why section 3 should go through as it is here, and why the word 'direct' is used. A great deal of argument has been put forward with reference to the fact that in the agreement the word 'direct' was not in, but that the word 'import' only was used. It does not seem to me that this is at all important. The fact that the word 'import' is used means that it must be an import under the customs laws of the country into which it comes. If goods exported from Canada into Holland bear a certain duty, and it becomes a Canadian import into that country, it follows the laws and regulations of the country into which it goes. A man might purchase some goods, and, without going through any regular customs formula, carry them in his pocket or in his wagon, but he would find that he could not make an importation in that way. An import into a country has to follow certain channels; it has to be governed by certain regulations, and unless those regulations and conditions are fulfilled, it is not, in the law of that country, an import. So you are not taking away one single iota of the breadth of the word 'import' in the agreement when you make it conform to the customs regulation, and the law upon which the regulation is based, to enable it to come into Canada as an import.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why not strike out the words?

Mr. FOSTER: I have been trying to impress upon my hon. friend the fact that we are not limiting what is really meant by the word 'import,' but we are making it more directly to conform with our customs laws, and as is done by every other country in the world. The hon. member for Weland has advanced the argument that West India goods remain West India goods, and are able to claim the privileges of this agreement, even though they are bought by a United States man, the United States duty paid on them, and then packed up and sent into Canada. The idea that such

goods could be called imports in the legal sense of the word, that they could be called goods of the West India Islands under the customs laws of the country to which they come—

Mr. McKENZIE: The agreement does not say goods of the West Indies—it says the produce or manufacture of the West Indies.

Mr. FOSTER: Produce and manufactures are goods; and the tariff applies to all goods, whether they are natural products or mechanical products, and as imports they are to come through the proper channel laid down by the customs laws of the country to which they come. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) asked the reason why in schedule C the same word 'direct' is not inserted. I have been thinking that over, and I do not see the exact reason why. There may be a reason, and I shall talk with the customs officers about it and find out whether or not it is necessary. According to the reasoning of my hon. friends, they should have no fault to find with that, for they are arguing against the word being put in the preceding section.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh no.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It should be out of both.

Mr. FOSTER: That criticism is quite fair, and I am not taking exception to it. I shall look into the matter, but I cannot deal with it fully at present. It may be that it should go in as it is, or it is possible that the word 'direct' should be added.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The same reason applies to both.

Mr. FOSTER: That does not prevent us from passing section 3, about which there is no doubt, in order that we may go on with the others.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister has not dealt with the point I ventured to make—and which I consider to be an important one—that there is nothing in the treaty which says anything about the British preference playing any part in the fixing of the duty. There is no warrant for sub-section (b) of section 3, so far as the treaty is concerned.

I may say to the hon. minister that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have no desire except to have this Bill put through in proper shape. The principle of the treaty is one, which, I understand, my hon. friends here as well as myself, are anxious to see ratified with the proper precautions in the interests of Canada. I wish to put this view before my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and it is very largely at the basis of this legislation. The popular view in Canada has been