

unanimously adopted. That is the only reason that I venture to suggest that very great care should be taken for that purpose. Personally I am bound to say that we should use words that would make it clear beyond peradventure that we are not imposing upon ourselves or upon any of our officials any obligation to search or investigate the cargo of a ship, but that we must take, as we always have taken, and always should take, the manifest in good faith as representing the contents of the cargo; and other countries must accept that in the same good faith.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend at the beginning of his remarks read two or three despatches which he said did not bear out a statement that I made this afternoon. I quite agree with him that the despatches which he read did not, and for the very good reason that those despatches appeared subsequently to the period of the conference to which my remark related. What I said this afternoon, if I am not wholly mistaken, was that when the United States suggested a conference for considering means of amending the treaty they urged more particularly that the conference should relate to the export of liquor, and liquor only. I said that in one of those despatches to the United States it was intimated that while the present administration was willing to have its officials go into conference, we would like the conference to be broader in its scope than to deal simply with the question of smuggling liquor, that its scope should be wide enough to include consideration of the smuggling of merchandise. That despatch my hon. friend will find there of record, but it is prior to the period of the conference, not subsequent to it. That was the point I was seeking to make this afternoon. The United States understand perfectly well that such is our desire, that any treaty to be entered into or any amendment to an existing treaty shall relate not merely to the question of the smuggling of liquor as between the two countries but to the broad question of the smuggling of merchandise of any character whatsoever.

My hon. friend has referred to the fact that the United States made a very generous offer in that it proposed to have the treaty embrace—I do not know that he used the words in relation to the despatch of the United States—but he mentioned silks and cigarettes.

Mr. BENNETT: I said commodities.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, and gave silks and cigarettes as illustrations. If my hon. friend looks at the despatch of the United States, he will find that it refers to articles which are prohibited entry into Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: Or restricted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Or restricted in that sense—not articles that are simply restricted by a customs duty, but are prohibited from entering the country. When my hon. friend places that interpretation upon the offer which was made, I think he will find that its application was not as broad as he would have the house believe it was. However, now that it has been decided that we shall continue our efforts to get a treaty that we hope will appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite as well as to ourselves, we shall make a further effort to see that the application of the treaty to merchandise generally is taken full note of, and that the treaty goes as far as it is possible to go to improve the conditions of dealing with the problem of goods being smuggled between the two countries.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Would it be reasonable to ask why the government did not accept the offer which the United States made last spring, offering reciprocal terms to cover everything?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was not made to cover everything, but only things that were prohibited—

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: To cover all articles prohibited.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, and at the present time there is absolutely nothing prohibited entrance into this country from the United States.

Mr. MANION: Alcohol is prohibited entry unless it is imported by some of the provincial governments.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If it is imported by the provincial government, it is not prohibited. But my hon. friend was speaking of merchandise outside of alcohol, and I repeat that there is no merchandise that is prohibited entrance into this country except perhaps narcotics.

Mr. CAHAN: I thought oleomargarine was prohibited entrance into this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: One would not have thought so to listen to the discussion the other day.

Mr. CAHAN: It is prohibited, is it not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I wish to make clear is that the United States proposal related to articles prohibited entry into Canada, and when one attempts to enumerate those articles they do not appear as numerous as the words of my hon. friend would lead the house to expect.