

Minister who is chiefly responsible for this change, all due credit therefor. Canada has done something. She has not been an altogether unsympathetic neighbour, but has co-operated in many ways, some of which have been quite effective, to make it easier for the United States to repel and to apprehend these would-be lawbreakers. Export houses no longer flourish to the same degree as they did some four years ago. And there are fewer export docks, the number in the Windsor district having dropped from fifty to ten, with corresponding reductions elsewhere. I know that the motive for the Government's course of action was not primarily a desire to co-operate with the United States, particularly, but sympathy with and for the furtherance of the objects of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario. Nevertheless, the result has been to diminish the facilities and restrain the activities of would-be lawbreakers.

I might go on and mention other commendable acts of the Government. Not long ago it was possible for a vessel laden with liquor and arriving at Halifax, St. John, or any other Maritime port, to extend itself there, form depots, and stock them for the rum runner to smuggle into the United States.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Now they go to St. Pierre.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Now they go to St. Pierre, and I suppose the inference to be drawn from that remark is that we ought to get into touch with St. Pierre and endeavour to have that traffic put an end to there.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: That is where the trade is now.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: I am quite sure that my honourable friend does not mean by that remark that he would have preferred to have the traffic continued at Halifax.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: I do not mean that.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Not at all. We have gained something by keeping these vessels as far off as Miquelon and St. Pierre. Stormy seas intervene. There is some hope that some of the vessels may go up on the rocks, or that the activities of some of them may be terminated by other means. There is always the possibility that the hi-jacker may intervene, seize the whole illegal cargo and pervert it to his own profit. From among the hi-jacker, the smuggler and the abettor of lawlessness there is not much to choose.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER.

I repeat that I give credit to the Government and to the energetic Minister who, I believe, puts into this matter his mind and a goodly portion of his heart. I wish he could put his whole heart into it. But I must say here that I do not like the doctrine which was enunciated in another place a day or so ago, when it was stated that it was the Government's policy to treat a rum cargo exactly the same as a load of potatoes. I think a great fallacy underlies a statement and a practice of that kind. I take the familiar and homely spud and I go to the place of its generation, and I follow it up through all the stages of its growth, its handling, its being gathered, stored in cellars and warehouses, loaded on a vehicle of transportation and carried to its place of ultimate consumption, wherever that may be. But from the time that the spud begins to germinate in the field until it is consumed, I fail to find it accompanied by an army, or by an escort of Customs officers and preventive officials. There should be a difference between the treatment that is given to a load of potatoes and that which an illicit rum cargo receives. Furthermore, when the mild and well favoured potato is transported from this country across the boundaries of the United States, it is not pounced upon by Customs officers and thrown into the refuse heap, or otherwise maltreated. The spud maintains its honourable and useful character wherever it goes. Its entry into that community of 120 millions of people is legal and subject to the payment of duty, and it arrives there with its name unscathed and its character untarnished. Surely in this regard there is a great difference between a load of potatoes and a cargo of illegal liquor. I want that point noted, so that we may shun the delusion that there is no difference between the two.

Another fallacy underlies the assertion that the rum runner who finds his cargo in Canada and heads for the United States, either by land or water, is a gentleman, an honest trader, until he oversteps the boundary line between the two countries, although the moment he crosses that line, by so much as a few inches or a foot, he becomes a disreputable lawbreaker. The fact is that from the beginning to the end of his trip he has but one purpose, and if he goes no farther than the border he is of the same dishonest fibre as his ally to whom he delivers the cargo on the other side, because the second part of such a combination would be powerless and ineffective without the first part. All who participate in the rum running business are in the same class, are of one mind, and have but one object in view—the illegal