

sixty, ninety days; and in this particular clause you say "one month".

Mr. Howell: I am not quite sure I know the explanation, but I think it is on the basis that we are talking about warehouses, and the warehouse rent is usually based on one month and not a number of days. I think this is probably the reason it is used there.

Senator Hastings: If we are going to be consistent, should we not say "thirty days"?

Mr. Howell: It has always read like this, but we can change it. We spoke to our lawyers about this point and they said, "It has always been one month." 'If goods go into warehouse on the 28th of the month, they are there until the next 28th. If you put them in on the 5th, they are there until the 5th of the next month.

Senator Hastings: But the length of the months varies—28, 30, 31 days. When you refer to days 17 times in other places in the act, it would be consistent to refer to "30 days" in this clause.

The Chairman: The difference is that in the subsection you are referring to you are talking about "not duly entered within one month"—that is, into warehouse.

In section 2 they talk about "within thirty days," but this is not in relation to the entering into warehouse. It is the time limit you have after entry or landing of any goods. It applies to different circumstances, so consistency would not necessarily be a virtue there.

Senator Thorvaldson: Supposing the goods come into warehouse on February 28 and they are there for one month, until March 28; but if you come in on March 1, it is a 31-day month.

Mr. Howell: Yes.

Senator Kinley: It seems to me the only difference is the destruction of goods. The amendment does not provide for destruction of goods. The law used to be that they would be destroyed. What action do you take now when you make the sale yourself?

Mr. Howell: We sell the goods.

Senator Kinley: But do you give the importer anything that is left?

Mr. Howell: Yes.

Senator Kinley: Otherwise, under the old act, you destroyed the goods.

Mr. Howell: Yes, the law said to destroy the goods, but we actually did not; we sold them for duties and taxes.

Senator Carter: What do you do with beer now, do you sell it or does it still go down the drain?

Mr. Howell: No, we cannot sell alcoholic beverages.

Senator Thorvaldson: I think that is a terrible waste.

Mr. Howell: Under the Importation of Alcoholic Liquors Act, passed in 1928 after a long series of very unfortunate circumstances along the Canadian-American border, this act stated that none but liquor commissions may import liquor into Canada, either from outside of Canada or inside Canada.

Senator Thorvaldson: I think we should get sensible and do some revising of those provisions.

The Chairman: The only difficulty you have is that you have one purchasing authority in each province that is very anxious that as much revenue as possible should be produced from that purchaser. To make assurance doubly sure, they have no competing purchaser.

Senator Thorvaldson: But the fact is that these circumstances create very big waste, economic waste, which as sensible people we should not tolerate in this country any more—whether it concerns alcoholic beverages or any other kind of confiscation of goods seized under any act whatsoever.

The Chairman: If, instead of destroying them you distributed them to, say, some of the welfare agencies, you can imagine the howl that would be raised—not necessarily by the residents, but by those charged with the administration of welfare.

Mr. Howell: The liquor boards cannot very well buy this liquor from us because this may be a brand they have never purchased and do not carry; it might be of a different strength, different stock, different flavour, and consequently, they do not put it on their shelves.

Senator Macnaughton: May I point out that we have the jurisdiction on the Hill to open up a depository.

The Chairman: That is not covered by the bill before us. Are there any other questions on section 1 of the bill? Does section 1 carry?

Hon. Senators: Carried.