

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): On March 4, last an order for a return was passed regarding the amounts of money loaned by Canada to Greece and Roumania since April 19, 1920. I called the attention of the Government on April 29, to the fact that the return had not been brought down, and the hon. Minister of Finance said that he would make inquiry, but the return has not been brought down yet. I can therefore only conclude that the Government does not intend to have the matter discussed on the Budget.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I speak only from recollection, but I think the information has been given to the House, if not in the form of a return, in answer to a question. In fact, I recall being in my place and hearing the matter referred to.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I know I did not get the return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps it was in answer to a question. I will make a note and direct the hon. gentleman's attention to where he will find the information.

#### OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUGS

On the Order: Third reading of Bill No. 81, to amend the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): At the request of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Calder), I beg to move that this Bill be referred back to committee for the purpose of amending subsection (e) of section 1 by adding thereto the following words:

In any case where a fine is imposed the sentence may adjudge a term of imprisonment or a further term of imprisonment not exceeding in any case twelve months to be served by the offender if such fine is not paid.

The member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) having called attention to the fact that in the Bill as it went through the committee, here is a provision under which a penalty may be imposed in the form of a fine, and no specific provision fixing a period of imprisonment to be imposed in default of payment of that fine, I find, on looking into the matter, that the hon. gentleman was quite right in saying that under any general provision of law the maximum imprisonment under those circumstances, would be three months; and I agree with him that in the case of this particular offence the term of imprisonment in default of payment of the fine should be longer.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maison-neuve—Gaspé): When we were discussing this Bill the other day I mentioned to my hon. friend the Minister of Health that a seizure was made not long ago in the city of Montreal of two or three trunks filled with cocaine, presumably imported from Europe. That cocaine was seized and delivered to the police court authorities, and later on some persons, evidently the owners, in league with certain lawless characters, broke into the Court House and got possession of the drug. I am told that the cocaine has been located and that attempts are again being made to get it back. My hon. friend said the other day that he had been informed of the fact, and would give some information in regard to the case.

Mr. CALDER: When the matter was drawn to my attention the other day by the hon. member I said that I had asked for information respecting this incident. It has not yet come to me from the department, so that apart from my knowledge of the fact that this cocaine was lost sight of for a while, I really know nothing about the matter. I shall be glad shortly to ascertain the facts and inform the hon. member accordingly.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Bill as amended reported, read the third time and passed.

#### JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 60, to amend the Judges' Act.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The amendments which the Senate has made to this Bill have no relation to or connection with the provisions of the Bill itself. With one exception, they deal with a perfectly distinct subject. There is an amendment in which I propose to ask concurrence, but another amendment deals with the subject of judges acting on commissions and provides that no judge mentioned in this Act shall act as a commissioner or arbitrator on any commission or inquiry, provided that this section shall not interfere with judges who are at present acting as commissioners or arbitrators, completing the work on which they are engaged. This proposed amendment raises, of course, a very important question. I do not desire to pronounce now pro or con on the merits of the proposal, but I may point out that it is a question