

War Services Regulations, which are referred to therein. A similar correction has been made in section 5. From section 6 the words "taken under this Act" have been eliminated as superfluous.

Section 8 has been changed by adding the two sections of definitions to which I referred. Subsection 1 would provide:

The Chief Electoral Officer under The Dominion Elections Act, 1938, shall be the Chief Plebiscite Officer for the purposes of this Act. . . .

And subsection 2 would provide:

For the purposes of taking the plebiscite only, the Governor in Council may appoint a returning officer for the Yellowknife Administrative District. . . .

That is put in an affirmative statement rather than being left in the somewhat left-handed way that it was under the definitions in section 2. Section 8 itself, as it appears in the text, with one or two slight grammatical modifications, would become subsection 3 of section 8.

In section 9 there are one or two changes in language. The original wording is:

The Governor in Council may, for the purposes of this Act, make such regulations as are expedient for the effectual taking of the plebiscite. . . .

The words "for the effectual taking of the plebiscite" are either superfluous or misleading. The powers of the Governor in Council in making regulations should be for the purposes of the Act. If there is only one purpose, it is superfluous to add these words; and if there are more purposes than one, they should not be limited by these words. The amended section would read:

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as are expedient for the purposes of this Act. . . .

Subsection 4, which has been added to section 9, specifically gives the Governor in Council powers to impose penalties. These powers might have been inferred from the Bill as it read, but the implication was not clear. I understand an amendment is to be proposed to the new subsection 4.

Right Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It was proposed in the committee this morning that section 9 be amended by adding subsection 4, the last phrase of which would provide:

. . . but no such penalty shall exceed a fine of two thousand dollars or imprisonment for any term exceeding two years, or both fine and imprisonment.

Our Law Clerk drew my attention to the fact that it would be advisable to drop the last phrase of subsection 4 of section 9. In section 9 the Governor in Council is required to make

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

regulations in conformity with the Dominion Elections Act of 1938. Section 29 of that Act provides that persons guilty of the offences set out therein shall in addition to other penalties be disqualified from voting for a term of seven years. In order to preserve that particular penalty it would be advisable to delete the latter part of subsection 4 of section 9 of this Bill, and leave the subsection ending with the word "indictment" in the fifth line. If it is agreeable to honourable members, I will ask the honourable senator from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Hayden) to propose this amendment now.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: I move that the report be amended with respect to subsection 4 of section 9 as indicated by the right honourable leader of the House.

Hon. Mr. COTE: I do not wish to be technical, but I am wondering whether it is according to our rules to amend the report of a committee before a motion has been made for its adoption.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We can either amend the report now or move the amendment on the motion for third reading. I thought that, as the report dealt with that clause, I should apprise the Senate of my intention to have this amendment moved. Though it may not conform with our practice, I think it would simplify matters to take action now.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: At the moment we are considering the motion to adopt the report. Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the report with all the amendments that have been proposed?

Some Hon. SENATORS: Carried.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: When shall this Bill, as amended, be read a third time?

Right Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would draw attention to an amendment which was made in the French text of the question to be submitted to the electorate. The question as it came before us in committee this morning was as follows:

Consentez-vous à libérer le Gouvernement de toute obligation résultant d'engagements antérieurs restreignant les méthodes de recrutement pour le service militaire?

An honourable senator suggested that the word "recrutement" be changed to "mobilisation," and the suggestion was accepted. The question as amended now reads:

Consentez-vous à libérer le Gouvernement de toute obligation résultant d'engagements antérieurs restreignant les méthodes de mobilisation pour le service militaire?