

has been done by Mexico—which in many things is not a very good example—and by Cuba.

Having said so much to show that the question is not easily solved, and that there are a great many things that we do not see clearly, nevertheless I think we are making progress, and that the two Governments will continue to keep closely in touch, and perhaps will be able to devise some means to assist in limiting the traffic in liquor from Canada to the United States.

Having taken the bold stand that the United States has not done her best in this matter, I want to call attention to another fact, namely that our negotiations with our friends across the line are not always responded to as quickly as they might be. For a time, you will remember, we were very dry, particularly in Ontario. During that time we never had any aid or sympathy from the United States in stopping the flow of liquor from the other side. I am mentioning this just to show the attitude of many of our people.

Then there is the well known fact—it was referred to before the Commission of investigation—that even since we have had liquor control alcohol in large quantities has come in from the United States. Many of our druggists to-day buy alcohol at a very low price because it has been smuggled in from the United States. The negotiators may have discussed that question. Another matter of paramount importance is the fact that every smuggler who took a cargo of liquor across the imaginary line smuggled back just as full a cargo of silk and things of that kind. Our friends across the line did not assist us very strenuously in stopping that sort of thing. But our Customs Department, following the investigation, put on more men, spent more money, and put more boats into service in the Maritime Provinces. What I want to impress on honourable gentlemen is that the United States, in wishing us to go further than we have gone, to go further than Great Britain has gone, should at least do her very best to enforce her own law. If she wants us to do something, she should reciprocate, and reciprocate very heartily.

As I have said, I will call the attention of the honourable leader of the Government, when he is here, to the very eloquent remarks of my right honourable friend.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Will the honourable gentleman permit a question?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Certainly.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: In looking over the correspondence I find the statement that Great Britain does not issue

clearances for liquor cargoes to any United States port. That statement was denied by members of the Canadian delegation, but I find it was made by the British Embassy in Washington and forwarded to the United States Government. I wish my right honourable friend, who is now the leader of the Government—and a very agreeable leader—would find out for me which statement is correct. As I read it I come to this conclusion: that while the British Government does not issue any clearances for liquor cargoes to the United States, yet it is possible for liquor cargoes to be cleared. I do not know whether the British Government feels that if those cargoes are interchanged on the ocean, it has nothing to do with them at all, and no authority. It may be that between those two things there is a little misunderstanding, and I think it would be an advantage to get that matter cleared up and know exactly how it stands.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I certainly will ask the leader of the Government to look into that matter. My own view was that to all intents and purposes Great Britain issued clearances for liquor that was assuredly going to the United States, though it might be short-circuited en route. From an article that I read in one of last night's papers, purporting to originate with a Minister of the Crown, I understood that Great Britain still granted clearances for liquor cargoes.

Hon. GEORGE GORDON: Honourable gentlemen, in view of the fact that we have a new leader—one whom we all respect and like very much—perhaps, with his consent and that of the House, it may not be inappropriate for me to add a few words with reference to the speech of the right honourable gentleman from Ottawa (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster), to which I have listened with great pleasure. Would it be in order?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: There is no law to prevent it, much as we might want to.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I shall be very brief. I entirely sympathize with a great deal that has been said by my right honourable friend from Ottawa, because I have about as much use for liquor as he has. But this is a matter that must be looked at in a practical way. If by one stroke of the hand I could wipe out every distillery in the world, I would gladly do it, provided that in so doing I should wipe liquor off the face of the earth; but, knowing perfectly well that my action would have no such effect, I think it would be useless to attempt any such thing.