

possibility of arresting the offenders. So these are some of the cases which we envisaged by this section and which we want to cover in order to give the board's constables effective jurisdiction to apprehend those violators of the speed limit and with regard to goods stolen and taken away from the board's property. However, I personally have an open mind on the subject, and I must confess I have even drafted an amendment leaving the mileage blank. I am in the hands of the committee, but I do not think we should cut it down too much, because in doing so we might prejudice the position of the board in future cases by rendering null the jurisdiction we are giving the constables.

Mr. WINCH: Could I ask a question there? On the case you stated in Montreal where this man stole some goods from the property and hid or stored them some miles distant, did you have to swear out a search warrant before you could go into the other property?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Yes.

Mr. WINCH: Then if you have to go through the process of swearing out a search warrant can you not get an officer right there who is inside that jurisdiction for the serving of that warrant and for the making of the search?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Counsel for the board is probably in a better position to answer that than I am.

Mr. FINLAY: The explanation is only this: it is quite true, as you say, that it would be absolutely necessary to get a search warrant. Actually the jurisdiction of the police constable is not enlarged in that respect. The only advantage—and that of course is why the parliamentary assistant said the range was not terrifically important—is that in the Montreal case had our police been able to go before the magistrate and get the warrant and then proceed we believe we could have acted in time, but it so happened that we found it difficult to get cooperation from some of the local police officials in actually making the search. You see, after having obtained the warrant our men were still not police officers in that area. It is not suggested that our harbour police should be able to do anything in the way of searching without authority from the court. There is nothing in the Act to that effect. They must go to the court like any other police officers. It is merely that our own police would be able to act instead of delegating it to local police; that is, within a certain range. That is the only purpose of it, but then again, as has been pointed out, the offence must be committed on board property or in relation to board property. That is the only purpose of this 50 miles.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Do you not use the services of the mounted police presently in the execution of these warrants?

Mr. FINLAY: No. As a matter of fact, the mounted police, I might say, are far too busy with various other matters—they are a relatively small force—and they are simply not in a position to attend to a good many of the relatively minor affairs that do arise in connection with port administration.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Then I suppose you have to go through the ordinary execution by the justice of the peace in Montreal?

Mr. FINLAY: We would not change that. We would still have to go to the court.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: Then I am perfectly aware of the situation and I admit that most of the time action would be delayed for one reason or another. I am perfectly aware of the situation.

Mr. BELL: I feel quite strongly about the increase in jurisdiction and to my mind the difference between 5 miles and 50 miles is a point that should be argued. Fifty miles is a serious extension of jurisdiction. There might be some small excuse or justification for this extension, but I do not think we