

and the House of Representatives, but also the approbation of three-quarters of the States of the Union.

What did the nations say to the United States of America? They met them, I think, in a very reasonable way. They paid some respect to the fact that a great nation of 120,000,000 people, working against an age-long evil of admitted intensity, had come to the conclusion according to its conscience and conviction as embodied in the constitution. So from various countries the United States of America received sympathetic help. First, all the nations gave adhesion to a system of port regulations necessary to prevent smuggling by foreign ships visiting the United States. Then came the wider sphere of sympathetic assistance, which was in the line of getting countries to pass legislation or make regulations, not to enforce the prohibitory law of the United States, which the people of the United States proposed to do and ought to do themselves, but to make it a little more difficult for law-breakers and rum-runners from these countries to violate the legally embodied conscience and conviction of the people of the United States. Great Britain held conferences with the United States. While she did not go as far as the United States would have liked her to go, she went a long distance and placed difficulties in the way of those who proposed to violate the law of the United States, by extending the area from the three-mile limit to the twelve-mile or the fifteen-mile limit—to be exact, one hour's steaming distance from the shore. Within that extended limit, whatever it may be, the United States was empowered, so far as British vessels were concerned, to hold them if they were suspected, to examine them if that was thought necessary, and to seize them and take them into port. That was as far as Britain went, but it was a great distance to go, and proved a great help to the enforcement squadrons and authorities of the United States.

Canada adopted the same principle, which was embodied in the Treaty of 1924. Cuba, a near neighbour, did exactly what the United States asked her to do, and made a convention or treaty under which clearance was refused to any vessel having a cargo of liquor destined to the United States, or which, even though purporting to be for other countries, was thought to be for rum-running purposes. Mexico, on the southern border of the United States, concluded a treaty of exactly the same import. Norway not only refuses clearances, but punishes navigators or carriers who engage in this illicit traffic. Eleven states bordering on the Baltic have passed legislation

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER.

which is favourable to the prevention of these raids from outside, and lately Japan has made a convention along the same lines.

And now the United States comes to Canada and says, "You are our nearest neighbour."—I think I may well translate that by another adjective—"You are our dearest neighbour, our most intimate neighbour, with whom we have most of our dealings, and with whom our relations are most agreeable." They ask us whether or not we cannot do the same thing that Mexico and Cuba have done—not to go over into the United States to help them enforce the law, but simply to make it less easy for those who in our country band themselves together to defeat the purpose of American legislation by smuggling liquors into that country. I think, honourable gentlemen, that there is a vast difference, according to the angle from which you view the question. How easy it is to tell the man on the street: "That is their own kettle of fish; let them stew it themselves. They passed the legislation. It is their problem, let them solve it." But I think they are justified in asking us out of good-will and mutual interest to assist them to the extent of refusing would-be lawbreakers, whether their own citizens or ours, harbourage, and sustenance, and ammunition, and arms, in their assault upon the legislation of a neighbouring country.

There is a difference in the point of view, but I think my point of view is a reasonable one. So much then with reference to the historical background of the United States.

Negotiations were commenced between the two governments in 1925, and continued for a period of nearly two years, during which time the United States was trying to get its proposal before the Canadian Government and to have it embodied in a convention or agreement. One thing after another stood in the way, and the final delay was caused by the fact that the Royal Commission was at work. It was very good policy for both our Government and the Government of the United States to wait until that investigation was completed. So there was an interregnum until the report was finally issued and digested, and then there came the conference of last January.

Now, it would be interesting to review and comment upon what took place in that conference between the officials of Canada and the officials of the United States, all of whom were practical, clever men. I cannot read over the report of what was said pro and con at the conference without feeling, however, that the Canadian representatives were more fruitful in finding objections to co-operation than in