

Mr. CAHAN: Well, that carries the ultimate destination, whatever it may be in the meaning of the term used, so that under this law as now proposed, you are bound to search every ship to ascertain whether or not liquor is on board. The entries outwards will not be relied upon, and it must be determined whether, in the circumstances of the case, the ultimate destination is a United States port or run row off the United States coast, no matter what the intermediate port may be at which the vessel proposes to call and for which she may be cleared.

Mr. MANION: I made the observation a few moments ago that trade was war, and this seemed to be received on the other side of the house with a good deal of jocularly. I notice the hon. member for Weyburn seems to be still enjoying my remark, but that may be because he has only now got the joke. It is a well-known fact that when trade matters are being considered the tariff barriers which countries put up against each other are a very important factor. Trade is a battle for the markets of the world, is a legitimate observation in economics. When I stated that the Prime Minister had thrown away his weapons I made use of another expression used in economics. When trade treaties are being negotiated the weapons used by either side are the tariffs of the respective countries, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this same principle contained in this bill could have been better carried out by this government in the negotiation of a treaty or convention, as suggested by the leader of the opposition, before this bill is passed rather than afterwards.

Mr. WHITE (Mount Royal): I suggest that the word "consigned" be substituted for the word "destined".

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this argument and I have an intense desire to be convinced that the interpretation placed by the Prime Minister upon the phraseology of this bill is the correct one, but I have some doubt as to the responsibilities which we might be placing upon ourselves by the provisions of the bill. I do not feel competent to suggest an amendment to the phraseology, but I think it could be amended by limiting the meaning of the word "destined" by the substitution therefor of some such words as "as designated by", mentioning the proper document. I understand that all these documents are sworn to, and unless the officers of the crown are prepared in a general sense to accept them they must be committed to the doctrine of search.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

There is nothing in the bill which would compel the officials to attach their signatures to any of these documents. They are prohibited from attaching their signatures under certain conditions, but the bill leaves some latitude in their being enabled to refuse to attach their signatures; they could take the matter under further consideration if any doubt existed in their mind as to the authenticity or accuracy of the documents. I am intensely anxious that this bill should pass, but I am also anxious that the phraseology should disclose the real intent as brought forth in this debate. After listening to both sides of the debate I cannot but think that the phraseology is somewhat ambiguous.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: A point has occurred to me in connection with paragraph (b).

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We are discussing paragraph (a).

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: We have been discussing paragraph (b) for some time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The word "destined" in paragraph (a) is what we have been discussing. We could pass paragraph (a) and then go to paragraph (b).

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment to the subsection carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph (a) as amended agreed to.

On subsection (1), paragraph (b)—Clearances.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Considerable liquor has been exported into the United States by means of trucks and other vehicles said to contain merchandise of other kinds. I remember one case where a carload of shingles was shipped to the United States, and when the car was opened by suspicious customs officials it was found that beer was hidden inside the shingles. Supposing a vessel cleared for Buffalo with a supposed cargo of hay, and underneath that hay twenty-five cases of whisky were hidden; what would be the position under this bill? It seems to me the United States would have good reason to complain that we were not carrying out our own law. In his remarks the other day the Prime Minister said:

Similarly, if anyone asks for the clearance to the United States of a vessel which is known to have liquor on board, that clearance will have to be refused.

Instead of saying "any vessel having on board any intoxicating liquor" why not say