

The Secretary of State concluded his *aide memoire* by stating that:

an order had been issued by the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, directing that vessels of the Coast Guard, while engaged in target practice, shall exercise the greatest care so as not to endanger vessels on the high seas.

The Ambassador felt that this was enough and advised that the matter now be allowed to drop. With this position, the Canadian Government was willing to agree, although it first considered the possibility of pressing for compensation.

The *Eastwood* affair was neither the first nor the last of the protests which the Canadian Government was to lodge or to have lodged with the United States concerning the manhandling of its ships by the United States Coast Guards during the prohibition era. It was, however, an extremely important case, for it demonstrated the positions of the various governments. To the United States the important thing was the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment by stopping the flow of liquor from Canada (even though it was acknowledged that only something between 2 per cent and 5 per cent of the illicit liquor consumed in the United States was derived from all foreign sources). The U.S. saw this as the central issue and probably considered the British and Canadian protests as, at best, picayune and perhaps arising out of ulterior motives. To the British it was essentially a matter of protecting their rights on the high seas, an issue dear to the hearts of British Governments from time immemorial. In private and semi-official conversations with the officials at the State Department, Sir Esmé Howard showed considerable sympathy for those who were required to enforce prohibition. But the maintenance of Britain's rights at sea was crucial to British power, and they had to be upheld. To achieve this it was sufficient to have an assurance from the United States that steps were being taken to prevent a repetition of the *Eastwood* incident. Thus Sir Esmé could accept the word of the commander of the *Seneca* over that of the master of the *Eastwood*, provided that an effort was made to have "target practice" conducted with greater care.

The aims of the Canadian Government were less simple. It, too, was anxious to see the safety of the seas maintained, but it wanted more than that. Throughout the smuggling incidents that arose between Canada and the United States, there was a desire by Canada to maintain its sovereign rights and possibly its *amour propre*. In incident after incident these were being challenged, whether by "target practice", bombardment, territorial intrusion or gun-fight. The attention that has been given to the *I'm Alone* case poses a threat to the maintenance of an historical perspective about the smuggling episodes. It has been suggested that the whole question at stake in the *I'm Alone* case boiled down to the use of arbitration as a method of settling international disputes between Canada and the United States. (3) That it was important that these incidents were settled by arbitration is undeniable; but more crucial than whether

(3) See, for example, M. Paul Holsinger, "The *I'm Alone* Controversy", in *Mid-America*, Vol. 50, No. 4, October 1968.