

short-circuiting I mean that a boat would be cleared from some Canadian port, would go out two or three miles and then turn in to some cove a few miles farther down the shore. I presume that the end of short-circuiting is due to the Liquor Control Act of the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: And the collection of excise before shipment.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: And the collection of excise. Then the Canadian Government have ceased to give clearance to any vessel that is not competent to make the port for which it clears. For instance, they do not give clearance for Cuba to a boat that cannot make the trip. Then there were false certificates. I am told they have practically disappeared. Many of the things to which my right honourable friend referred, in reading the report of the Royal Commission and the report of the Committee of the House of Commons, do not now exist; and I think we can safely say that the Minister of Customs has been pretty energetic in carrying out the laws that we have. What the Minister meant by that reference to potatoes was that under the existing law the export of liquor was like the export of potatoes, or any other commodity, so long as it complied with the law. I do not think he was saying that the law might not be changed. Under the existing law his statement was absolutely correct.

I do not want to cast any dissension over our friendship with the United States, which was so ably delineated by my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster), but I think that before asking us to pass legislation which will assist in the enforcement of its laws a friendly nation should first see to their enforcement in its own country. It is a hard task and a heavy one, but I submit that so long as the United States continues to select men to carry out the provisions of such measures as the Volstead Act from a party and political standpoint, it cannot hope to succeed thoroughly in their enforcement.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: It is now under the Civil Service.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: But it has not been in the past. Several years ago, being a representative of the county of Essex, I was moving in and out along the border for some years, and what I saw led me to the conclusion that the attempted enforcement of its own laws by the United States was worse than a joke. The customs authorities on the other side of the line, not very far from a big city, would watch certain fellows start out with a boatload of liquor, and when

they thought the boat was sufficiently close to the American side they would find it convenient to disappear. What would be the use of notifying those officers, except to tell them when to get away from their posts? I am not exaggerating at all. Any person who knows the conditions on the border will thoroughly agree with me.

I am not so sure that my right honourable friend is correct in his judgment about the refusal of the United States to place officials in Canadian territory, and for this reason. I am told that a very large percentage of the tonnage used in this rum-running trade is American tonnage and American registration. The American officers could follow that tonnage right to shore. I am told also that a very large percentage of the men engaged in rum-running are American citizens. American officials could locate those men and could take them in charge as soon as they reached American territory, if they really wanted to enforce the Act.

My right honourable friend says that Norway makes it an offence for any Norwegian ship to carry an illegal cargo to the ports of another nation, and that the sailors are also liable to punishment. Why cannot the United States do the same with regard to its own tonnage and its own sailors? They come into our territory, and the American Government knows that they are coming into our territory to violate the law of the United States. Why does it not take charge of that tonnage and confiscate it, and punish its own citizens?

As I have said, this is a big question, but I believe we are making progress. I do not know what will be the answer of the honourable leader of the Government to this interrogation, because I am not the Government. However, I will call it to his attention. But this I do say, and I say it boldly, that in my humble judgment the United States ought to be more in earnest, more practical and less political in its enforcement of the Volstead Act before calling on any sister nation to do much more than we have done. We must not forget that Canada has done exactly what Great Britain has done, and that there may be some very potent reasons why Great Britain has seen fit to refuse to accede to the request of the United States to cease granting clearance to vessels carrying liquor cargoes. Canada has followed in the footsteps of Great Britain, I think, in everything she has done in regard to the twelve-mile limit, and one hour's sailing from shore, and all that sort of thing, but Great Britain has not seen her way clear to refuse clearances, even though that

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM.