

entry of liquor into the country of our neighbour to the south—and I can see no moral distinction between any of them.

It is sometimes argued that we have no right to interfere with an industry which is legal in this country, and that consequently we should not refuse clearances for the exports of brewers and distillers. But what is legal is changeable. A thing which is lawful to-day may, for reasons of public policy, be declared unlawful to-morrow. We need to get down to the truth that underlies the situation. Let us briefly attempt to do so.

I do not know the number of distilleries and breweries in this Dominion, but there are many and they are increasing in number and output. They get their product upon the market in such ways as are open to them, but they can get their liquor to the United States only by corrupting officials, by breaking the laws of a neighbour country, and, what is worse still, by active collusion, alliance and co-operation with rum runners and smugglers. Not a single cask of whiskey can go out of a Canadian distillery and find its way into the United States market unless there is resort to corruption, subterfuge and even violence. It is only by the connivance and active effort of such a combination that it is possible for this industry of brewing or distilling to sell its goods in the United States market. Every brewer or distiller knows that. And every child of observant nature and quick intellect, who is starting out on the way of life with its ears and eyes wide open, and who has an inquisitive mind, knows just as well as we do what is going on. It learns that a traffic is considered all right so long as the desired price and profits are obtained, even though the laws of another country are broken. The inference is that the same thing is allowable even though it involves the breaking of laws in our own country. My theory is that the man who does not respect the aggregate conscience and conviction, as these have been framed into law by democratic and constitutional methods, of another country of equal civilization with his own, is not very likely to honour the laws of his own country, if as a result of violating them he can make financial profits.

So I say we should give careful thought—I shall put it no more strongly than that—as to whether or not we are prepared to face international complications which are certain to arise if this thing goes on; and whether we are ready to risk the corrupting influence and the schooling in actual lawbreaking which are offshoots of these operations. Do we think we can afford to pay so high a price in order that brewers and distillers may make bigger

profits? They have all the rest of the world open to them to prey and fatten upon. They should not be allowed to conspire with bandits to break the laws of a neighbour country and thwart the will of a friendly neighbour. We are bound to seriously consider this question, and some day or other we shall have to reach a conclusion.

Let me make one other observation before I close the remarks to which honourable gentlemen have listened so carefully and so sweetly. This is not a temporary emergency question, nor a small one. The United States is our near neighbour, a country of 120 millions of people, with probably as high an average of intelligence, character and culture as any people in the world possess. By immense majorities persisting over a series of years, they have registered their will and their conviction as to the treatment which should be given to one particular commodity within their own country. Should we incur their ill-will, and, if so, can we afford to do so, for refusing what seems to them to be a reasonable sympathy and practical help, by providing place and opportunity for this traffic to continue? Depend upon it, the United States of America is bound to enforce its law. President Hoover is pledged to the enforcement of the law. Congress passed a vote of \$43,000,000 last Session in order to carry out its enforcement. A body of very able men were appointed just a day or two ago by President Hoover to look into the very bases and foundations of the lack of respect for law and enforcement of law, which is becoming so impressive a feature of United States civilization to-day. All these things look towards a determination to uphold this law, to enforce it, and to continue it. It lies before us, and it becomes us to think whether or not there is not some means, other than that which has already been adopted, by which we may co-operate with each other to promote amity or prevent the spirit of ill-feeling which is likely to arise.

We have a young External Affairs Department. Take my word for it that if that Department continues its existence, as it seems likely to do, it will have plenty of work which will be of such complexity and such spirit and quality as will try the very best of relations which exist between our two countries. The "I'm Alone" case is an instance. Suppose, just for example, that Belize had been in the same position of co-operation with the United States as Cuba, and had concluded a convention with the United States that it would not give clearance to prohibited cargoes which were bound for the United States, though they might