

*Export Act—Mr. Mackenzie King*

it is shipped into the United States. Now, the next step that is essential before the liquor can get from the distillery to the place of export is the permit for its removal from the distillery to the dock. That permit—I presented one to the house the other day—states on the face of it that the liquor is to be removed to the United States. That is why I used the words “known to be going to the United States.” To-day the official when he signs that permit signs a document which on its face shows that the liquor is to be removed to the United States, although we as a government know that the United States has a law which prohibits its importation; and we know that that liquor cannot get into the United States except by the agency of rum runners and bootleggers, who get the liquor in by violating the laws of that country. The third stage is where the liquor is to be cleared. There the customs official, not the excise official, is the one who has to do with it, and the clearance states that the liquor is destined for the United States. It is known to be going to the United States, into which country its importation is prohibited, and yet the government through its officials clears it in that way. In other words, the government's own officials are facilitating liquor getting into the hands of the criminal gangs who make their livelihood and fortunes for others out of smuggling liquor into another country the laws of which prohibit its importation.

Mr. CAHAN: Will the Prime Minister allow me to ask a question?—because I have no desire but to help him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure of that.

Mr. CAHAN: Does he suggest that when that statute comes before the court for interpretation the court is going to look at these permits and applications and other forms of the Department of National Revenue, which are changed from month to month and from year to year, in order to construe a statute of this parliament?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, for the simple reason that there will not be any forms or permits to look at after this bill becomes law.

Mr. CAHAN: Then we ought to make the statute conform to common sense and use Anglo-Saxon words with a clear understanding of the meaning of those words.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am just as great an admirer of Anglo-Saxon words as my hon. friend, but I think he is attaching undue importance to the meaning of the word that is used.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. CAHAN: Last evening, for instance, I happened to have dining with me a gentleman from Holland who, I think, is one of the best authorities on international law, and without explaining my view I put that bill before him. He said the use of the word “destined” in a statute, enacted under these circumstances, would mean that in effect this government guaranteed that no exports would be made except under the conditions stated in the permit. If my right hon. friend will use the word “designated” in the application for permit to release, or use the same word in the entries for export or in the manifest, he would make it quite clear. But when he uses the word “destined” you would need the aid of an all-wise Providence to know what is to be the destiny of the liquor when once it is released from the proper bonding house, warehouse or distillery.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must submit that my hon. friend has perhaps attached undue importance to the word itself, and that to some extent he is confusing the terms “destined” and “predestined”.

Mr. CAHAN: In accord with my faith it is natural for me to believe in predestination.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The phrase is “destined for delivery”; it is the destination that the documents carry on the face of them.

Mr. CAHAN: The documents carry on the face that goods are designated for delivery?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Designation or destination?

Mr. CAHAN: There is a difference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have to take my advice, at any rate, from the law officers of the crown, and I can assure my hon. friend that the phrase has been looked into very carefully. I have every assurance that the words as they now stand cover the exact meaning that I am trying to convey. The point the house is interested in having brought out clearly is that there is a difference between the agencies of government being used to enforce the law of another country, and the agencies of government being used in a manner which will facilitate the violation of the laws of another country. It is this latter use of government agencies against which the bill is aimed and which it is intended to rectify. There is no intention that the government by this enactment shall do more than control its own officials. It is not assuming any guarantee whatsoever with re-