

cheque, he is a forger; if he deliberately sets fire to property, he is guilty of arson. Under the law these crimes are punishable in varying degrees, but in the eyes of society the perpetrators are criminals whatever the degree of their guilt because they have overstepped the standard of conduct deemed primary by the whole community. When it comes to smuggling this is not necessarily true. People living near the border are disposed to think lightly on the moral aspects of smuggling; many of them at one time or another have even indulged in the practice to some extent themselves.

Doubtless today a lot of people take a mischievous delight in trying to outwit the customs examiners and police patrols along the border, and probably the common attitude toward smuggling stems from the frontier days before there were any trade restrictions. Still it gives rise to a serious situation, for the fact remains that the regulations could be enforced a great deal more effectively if the investigators didn't have to act without the cooperation of the public.

* * *

IN drawing up our present customs laws the legislators wisely provided for the imposition of voluntary penalties, whereby petty offences can be "fixed" without the delinquent having to appear in Court. But this privilege applies only to infractions of a minor nature where clearly there is no intention to commercialize.

The phenomenon that urges people to smuggle rather than pay a few cents duty is incongruous and mystifying, for often the amount to be saved is ridiculously small compared to the penalties incurred if the smuggler is caught.

Typical of what is happening every day is the case of a motorist who took his family to Malone, N.Y., for a Saturday afternoon's outing last autumn and after buying about \$50 worth of clothes and \$3 worth of groceries declared only the groceries at the port of entry. Some

of the clothing was being worn by his wife and daughters while the remainder was hidden in the cushions of the car; the outcome was that in addition to the duty plus a voluntary penalty equal to the value of the goods he had to pay \$50 for the release of his car which had been impounded under the Customs Act.

In another case, an itinerant photographer who bought an enlarging apparatus for \$60 and a safe light for \$2.50 paid duty on the latter amounting to 88 cents but said nothing about the former which he had secreted in the trunk of his car. Anxious to settle out of Court when members of the Force discovered the deception he paid a voluntary penalty equal to the cost of the article, plus the duty and \$100 for the release of his car. Actually, had he known it, the enlarger was non-dutiable. Thus he paid \$163.38 for attempting to slip into the country by stealth with something he could have brought in free of charge if he hadn't tried to evade the regulations, though the department took a lenient view and later returned the voluntary remittance to him.

The professional smuggler is an entirely different proposition. Usually he belongs to an organized gang whose sole objective is easy money. Often connected with underworld factions of large cities, these gentry will smuggle anything at any time just so long as it nets them a worth-while profit.

Their business had its genesis in American prohibition, though in those days the traffic was reversed and the commodity was strictly liquor. The repeal of prohibition ended the bootleg era, but it is worthy of note that many of those who ran booze back in the '20's and '30's still warrant the attention of our Preventive Service.

Today's smuggled goods vary according to price fluctuations in both countries. There now is a substantial price spread on radios, electrical appliances and automobiles. At the moment the greatest single headache to the police is