

This afternoon the right hon. gentleman made a suggestion which I for one resent very greatly. He said that had he introduced a treaty into this house, what a storm of objection there would have been. It was only on Wednesday last that, certainly as strongly as I could, I affirmed my faith in a treaty or an amendment to the existing treaty to meet the situation. It is all very well to speak of lack of good faith or lack of conviction with respect to these matters, but the conviction that I had years ago I still have in this regard and I propose to continue it. That conviction is that this is the only reasonable method by which the matter can be dealt with. Even Mexico dealt with it in this way and Cuba in like manner. Norway dealt with it in part in the same way. While Great Britain has not refused clearances, the matter is largely dealt with in that sense because in London in 1926 the conditions were formulated which would prevail in treatment of vessels that with the knowledge of British officials carried intoxicating liquor to the United States. But you could not get a clearance for an English ship out of an English port laden with liquor to the United States, for the reason that you could not get insurance at Lloyd's and no other reputable insurance company would insure such a vessel or cargo; because insurance companies take cognizance of the fact that under existing conditions a ship clearing from a port with a cargo for a country into which the importation of such a cargo is prohibited is on an illegal voyage.

When our delegates in January, 1929, sent a telegram to England inquiring as to the conditions under which England was dealing with clearances, the reply was that England was not refusing clearances; that she never did refuse them; but in the same report to which I have alluded—I shall not read it—there will be found at length the arrangement which had been arrived at in England in regard to this matter.

It is not correct for the right hon. gentleman to say that there would have been to a treaty objections that would not arise in connection with a bill. The treaty was reciprocal. What is more, it went further, it offered extradition with respect to customs cases. It would have been invaluable to the Minister of National Revenue to be able to go to the United States and, with the aid of an extradition treaty, bring back for trial those who had violated our laws and who had slipped across the border and laughed at us because there was no extradition treaty, and vice versa. It was one of the finest proposals that I have seen one nation make to another with respect to a matter of this kind. It was

reciprocal in its character, universal in its application, not only so with respect to the commodities covered, but also as to the method of transportation employed, and this was certainly a long step forward from what took place in 1924. But the basis of the convention in 1924 was the assertion on the part of the contracting parties that they were desirous of suppressing smuggling, and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George pointed out this afternoon that if you stop at the word "prohibition" in the first paragraph of the convention of 1924, you remove all the question about small boats bound for Mexico or other points to which clearances would be refused on suspicion and you leave only one thing to be dealt with, namely, the refusal to grant clearances to ships clearing for the United States of America. I am not going to traverse the ground that I covered the other day, but I shall content myself with directing attention to those words as they appear upon the record lest there be a misunderstanding. I think the Prime Minister must have spoken this afternoon without having the record before him, because the record is in direct opposition to what he said.

The amendment suggested by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George was to clear up ambiguities and uncertainties with respect to one paragraph of the bill. The amendments which the right hon. gentleman has now submitted to the committee cover, I think, two points of some importance. One of them was mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in the course of discussion the other day, and the other makes clear a difficulty which was referred to by another hon. member. It is not quite fair to ask the Prime Minister to consider this legal phase of the matter, but the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General are present, and I should like to ask: Is it abundantly clear in the bill that no obligation is imposed upon us to search ships for contraband of peace, not of war? That is, in granting a clearance, must we assume responsibility, under the legislation as it now stands, if it is subsequently ascertained that a portion of the cargo was intoxicating liquor? I am quite certain from what the Prime Minister said the other day that he had no intention of engaging this country in any such effort as to search ships to determine what the cargo was.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: That is clear. I gathered that again from his statement this afternoon. That being so, I think the objection, shall I say, made by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George this afternoon is well