

him correctly, himself suggested when we were in committee that some verbal change might be made in the Bill in order to render it somewhat more elastic, and from that view I gathered that he was of the opinion that there might be some modification.

Mr. CALDER: Under the Act creating the department, the Government can assign to that department the care or treatment of any returned man in any way it sees fit. The Bill is very broad in its terms, and any duties which the Governor in Council desires to assign to the minister of the department can be assigned under the Bill. As to whether the appropriation is sufficiently wide to deal with all forms of re-establishment is questionable. On the other hand, however, the department itself has certain appropriations out of which expenditures can be made, and I think there will be sufficient money to tide us over until the end of this fiscal year. If there is not, an urgent necessity exists for carrying out certain features of this work, and from what was said the other night, I am sure Parliament would agree to our getting a warrant for whatever expenditures might be necessary in that regard. That is, of course, if the appropriations prove inadequate.

SOLDIERS CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT ACT.

SENATE AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved the second reading of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 10, to amend the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act.

He said: It will be remembered that when this Bill was in committee in the House certain amendments were suggested, and they have been carried into the Bill by the Senate. In the original Bill, clause (h) of sub-section 2 reads:

For imposing penalties recoverable upon summary conviction for the violation of any provision of any such regulation.

It was suggested that a maximum penalty should be inserted, and the Bill has been altered to read:

For imposing penalties not exceeding in any case a fine of two hundred dollars or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months enforceable upon summary conviction for the violation of any provision of any such regulation.

It is proposed that the department have power to make regulations in reference [Mr. Maharg.]

to certain work and that they also have power to impose penalties for infraction of those regulations. The provision as it now stands limits the penalties to not more than two hundred dollars or three months' imprisonment. Then it was suggested by the leader of the Opposition that any regulations made under this Act should be submitted to Parliament within fifteen days, and accordingly there is added a sub-clause (i) for the purpose:

All regulations made hereunder approved by the Governor in Council shall be laid before Parliament within fifteen days after they are made, if Parliament is then sitting, and, if not, within fifteen days after the opening of the next session of Parliament.

In reference to sub-clause (b) of subsection 2, referring to the appointment of technical and special officers, a proviso is added by the Senate to this effect:

Provided, however, that the rules and regulations referred to shall contain such proper provisions as are necessary to have such appointments from time to time as required certified by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McMASTER: "Certified" seems a strange word.

Mr. CALDER: That is the term that is used. All appointments must be certified by the commission.

Mr. McKENZIE: I daresay it is too late to make any changes in this Bill now, but it seems to me that sub-clause (h) added by the Senate, fixing a maximum fine of two hundred dollars or imprisonment not to exceed three months, is rather an incongruous provision. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that there is palpably a discrepancy in proportion between two hundred dollars and three months. The common criminal law says that the limit of a fine is not to exceed twenty dollars or three months, which seems to be a fair proportion. To give the magistrate power of imposing a fine of two hundred dollars with an alternative of three months' imprisonment is not fair. He has, of course, the power to impose a fine of a dollar and upwards, but he can impose the maximum. If I may say so, I should like to see a more sensible ratio fixed between the fine and the imprisonment, and I would suggest that "not to exceed \$50 or three months' imprisonment" would meet the case.

Mr. DOHERTY: No doubt it seems that the fine and imprisonment are not evenly balanced. When the matter was before the House I suggested a fine of two hundred dollars or imprisonment of six