

Export Act—Mr. Robinson

After all, this is a problem for the United States to solve, if possible. While further aid from Canada would be helpful, that country cannot reasonably be asked to do more at the cost of undue sacrifice.

Here is a letter from Representative F. H. LaGuardia, Republican of New York state:

Washington, June 4. "Dry" America consumes more Canadian liquor than does "wet" Canada, Representative F. H. LaGuardia (R) of New York declared in the house. He lauded Canada's refusal to make a treaty with the United States forbidding exportation of liquor to this country.

"Canada has done more in helping enforcement of the prohibition laws in the United States than the government of the United States has been able to do," said LaGuardia; continuing:

"The present demands made on the Canadian government are nothing but a confession of weakness on the part of the United States government and an example of the complete failure of prohibition.

"Yet the government of the United States has the audacity to ask the foreign country to do that which apparently it has been unable to do within its own borders."

We might have sympathy with the United States government in the enforcement of their prohibition laws, but it is apparent to every fair-minded person that they are making only a haphazard attempt to enforce the law, and I think I can prove this fairly well later on. They say there are six carloads of liquor going into the city of Washington every month, coming from Canada, although of course I do not know how it gets through. During the past winter the Detroit News had photographs taken of the roads over the ice from the Canadian shore to the American side all along the frontier. They sent a reporter and a photographer up in an airplane, and from two o'clock in the afternoon until five o'clock in the evening they counted 75 automobiles and trucks going over the ice, loaded with beer and liquor from Amherstburg docks. No intelligent person can tell me that the United States, with its army of enforcement officers on the border, could not stop that traffic. We all remember when young Laframboise was shot; the American officers did not take after the boatloads of liquor going across, but chased the chap in the car. I would say there is only a very shallow attempt being made to enforce the law, particularly along the Detroit river and the shores of lake Erie.

The Minister of National Revenue is quoted in the Border Cities Star of July 31 as follows:

National Revenue Chief in New Criticism of Washington

The minister drew attention to the fact that under the United States law these small liquor-running vessels do not require to have registered

[Mr. Robinson.]

names, but merely numbers. It was an easy matter for the operators to change the numbers, and the Canadian customs officials have no means of knowing whether the number of a vessel being cleared was the registered number.

This is the weak reply of the United States to that statement:

The Canadian authorities had asked the United States authorities if it would not be possible to secure a check-up of the registered numbers so that the vessels might be more closely identified at Canadian ports, which would permit of more authentic information being furnished the American preventive forces. The American reply to this proposal was that they "hadn't" the staff.

Then I have a letter which appeared in the Toronto Globe of February 1, which may be of interest since it was in that great moral daily:

Liquor Export Question

To the Editor of the Globe: The hon. Mr. Euler recently stated that the inland revenue tax received by the Dominion of Canada on liquor exported to the United States in the past year amounted to \$13,000,000.

Just recently also the United States congress authorized the expenditure of \$33,000,000 to attempt to enforce their so-called prohibition law.

From this it would appear that the United States are only willing to spend less than 30 cents per head of its population to do this work, but, according to rumour, they are asking the people of Canada to forego a revenue on its legitimate business of at least \$1.30 per head.

If the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King really intends to ask the present session of parliament to prohibit the export of liquor to the United States, I hope he is quite sure the people of Canada, especially the thrifty people of Quebec, are so magnanimous that they are willing to have their taxes increased by \$1.30 for every man, woman and child, plus several million dollars more for enforcement of such an act, at the suggestion of a country which has never done anything but try to injure Canada commercially. How the United States would jeer at us if the shoe was on the other foot.

I have a few articles here which are not my opinions but which contain the opinions of nationally known men in the United States as to what they think of the prohibition law. I am bringing this out in order to impress upon the house that the United States should clean up its own backyard instead of asking Canada to do it. The first article I wish to read is dated February 24, and refers to Senator George W. Norris, one of the dry leaders of the United States:

Senator George W. Norris, leading dry, chairman of the Senate judiciary committee, introduces a resolution for an investigation of the methods of prohibition enforcement and the prohibition department's personnel.

"The object of my resolution," he explains, "is to determine whether or not prohibition can be enforced. In my opinion, an honest