

National Defence Tax

They have only four more days, they say, in June to comply with this requirement. The provision in the budget in this regard is not clear. I quote:

That every employer be required to deduct the tax imposed in respect of earnings of the employee earned or accruing due during and after July, 1940.

That every employer remit the tax collected at the source on the 16th day of September, 1940, and on the 15th day of each month thereafter.

These employers say that they pay their men for June on July 1. Does this requirement mean that the tax will be deducted from the June wages of these men on July 1? The words are not clear. I would ask the minister to state what the words mean.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of Finance): In the resolution and the act itself the meaning will be made clear. I believe the intention is that wages from July 1 shall be subject to the deduction.

Mr. CHURCH: Then wages due for all June and paid on July 1 will not be deducted or included in the return, as the press in some cases has stated it must be?

Mr. RALSTON: That will be dealt with in the bill. I think the intention is that wages earned from and including July 1 will be subject to the tax.

NATIONAL REGISTRATION

CALLING UP OF CLASSES UNDER THE NATIONAL RESOURCES MOBILIZATION ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. S. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I wish to ask a question of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Is it the intention of the government to carry out some scheme of registration under the mobilization act before the first class of men is called up for training under this act? If it is not, will the Prime Minister give the house information as to when the first men are likely to be called up?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government is proceeding with the preliminary plans for registration. Just what will take place either before or immediately thereafter, or how soon some of the classes to which my hon. friend refers may be called up is a matter which necessarily will have to be considered by the departments concerned. Information will be given to the house as soon as the matter is definitely decided. I regret that I cannot go any further than that in replying to the hon. member to-day.

[Mr. Church.]

BEAUHARNOIS POWER COMPANY

PROPOSED APPROVAL FOR DIVERSION OF ADDITIONAL 30,000 CUBIC SECOND FEET—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 9, respecting the Beauharnois Light, Heat and Power Company.

He said: The bill in question has but one operative clause, which provides for the diversion of an additional 30,000 cubic second feet through the Beauharnois canal. It provides that this diversion shall take place "in such manner, upon such terms and conditions and with such limitations and reservations as may be prescribed by order of the governor in council." The amendment offered by the senate adds to that a certain direction to the governor in council in preparing the order in council. The added clause is:

1. Page 2, line 14.—After "council" insert "which order shall provide that Beauharnois Light, Heat and Power Company shall settle, pay and fully provide for the claims of riparians and other persons, including navigation companies, who may sustain any loss or damage by the exercise or in consequence of the exercise, in whole or in part, of the right by this act granted, including the execution of any remedial or control works incidental to such exercise of such right, erected by or for the said Beauharnois Light, Heat and Power Company."

I do not know that there is any objection to the amendment. Provision would in any case have been made in the order in council to protect any persons or corporations damaged by the diversion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the proposed diversion?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does this not go a little further than that?

Mr. HOWE: Well, it seems to me it is a clause which would delight the heart of a lawyer anticipating litigation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): A lawyer drew it.

Mr. HOWE: To me it seems vague. It says "who may sustain any loss or damage", that the company "shall settle, pay and fully provide for the claims of riparians and other persons". It seems to me it might at least say "lawful claims".

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, that is understood; they must be just claims.

Mr. HOWE: Another vague part is the point which my hon. friend has raised. Does