

Mr. CAHAN: I did not say so. I said that it put too great obligations on this government in the way of enforcement without any reciprocal obligations on the part of the United States.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The point I wish to make clear is this: It is impossible for the government in any legislation of this kind to hope to please my hon. friend and those who think like him. We cannot hope to bring down legislation that is going to meet his wishes when he tells us in one and the same breath that the legislation we bring down goes too far and does not go far enough, that it does not do enough in the way of enforcement while at the same time it does too much in the way of enforcement.

Mr. CAHAN: Does the right hon. gentleman consider that quibbling is fair?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the position.

Mr. CAHAN: Does he think that quibbling does justice to a man occupying his position?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The legislation, my hon. friend says, ought to have been brought down years ago, and now that it is being brought down he says it is being brought down in too much of a hurry.

Hon. gentlemen opposite complain that we did not proceed by way of a treaty. What would have been the criticism we would have heard from them if we had come into this parliament with a treaty made with the United States at this time?

Mr. MANION: It would have been far better for Canada than what you are putting through now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We know what the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite would have been: It would have been that we had gone out of our way in order to go to Washington again to make a treaty. That is what we would have heard from them. May I tell my hon. friends opposite exactly the position we are in? If they have read the despatches carefully they will notice that at the time of the conference the government directed attention to the fact that the Americans were stressing the need for a treaty dealing only with one thing, namely liquor; and that we stressed the desire of dealing with merchandise generally.

Mr. BENNETT: And they consented to it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Exactly. And having consented to it, I imagine they will now be prepared to carry out any undertaking they were ready to carry out then. So we

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

are in this happy position to-day: We have hon. gentlemen opposite and their press joining with us in the view that we ought to have a treaty. May I tell them, so that their minds will be relieved immediately, that having cleaned our own skirts so far as the actions of our own officials are concerned, we are proceeding now to get a treaty, and we will see to it that it is broad enough to cover all articles of merchandise. We are in a strong position, we are able to assure our neighbours that on this we are all of one mind. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite, when the treaty is presented to this house, as I hope it will be shortly, will give us their unanimous approval of it.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested that we take the first part of section one.

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other statute or law or of any regulation made thereunder or of any bond, agreement or other instrument relating thereto.

Mr. ROBINSON: Before that is put, I would like to make a few observations in connection with this bill. In the first place, we have heard nothing from the government as to why they have changed their policy of less than a year ago. That policy was applauded by all the members on the government side of the house, and by a goodly portion of both the press of Canada and the United States. It is my submission that the house is entitled to that information, because one department of the government of the great country to the south of us has practically acknowledged its failure to enforce the Volstead Act, and is now passing the buck by laying the blame on Canada, although only from 2 to 4 per cent of the liquor consumed in the United States is exported from this country. At the present time the Volstead Act is a national joke across the border, and they would now swear in the Canadian government as part of their police force to help enforce this American law. The eighteenth amendment is a political issue in the United States, and that being the case I think it would be well for us to wait a while, and see how they come out with the poll which is being taken by the Literary Digest, and which is showing distinctly that the majority of the people on the other side of the line are opposed to the eighteenth amendment.